



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

"MADE IN
GERMANY"

▼
FRANKLIN M.
SPRAGUE
A.M.
▼

Ger 2397.115.205

Harvard College
Library



THE GIFT OF
HORACE L. WHEELER
OF BOSTON
Class of 1881

"MADE IN GERMANY"

BY

FRANKLIN M. SPRAGUE, A.M.

AUTHOR OF "SOCIALISM FROM GENESIS TO REVELATION,"
AND "THE LAWS OF SOCIAL EVOLUTION; A CRITIQUE
ON KIDD'S SOCIAL EVOLUTION"

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

THEODORE ROOSEVELT



THE PILGRIM PRESS

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

“MADE IN GERMANY”

✓
Ger 2397.115.205

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF
HORACE L. WHEELER—
NOV 5 1927

COPYRIGHT 1915
BY FRANKLIN M. SPRAGUE

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON

The Kaiser had the moral courage to assume the responsibility of beginning the conflict.—*"The Truth About Germany,"* p. 29.*

Germany should crush England, break up Russia and reduce France to vassalage.—*Professor Wilhelm Oswald,* p. 44. t^

War is in itself a good thing.—*Bernhardi,* p. 43.

The Germans must, regardless of the rights and interest of other peoples, fight their way to predominance and force upon humanity German Culture and Spirit.—*"Germany in the Next War,"* p. 99.

It is the grossest immorality that nations should respect the possessions of other nations.—*Professor Hugo Münsterberg,* p. 171.

This step (beginning the war) was taken on his majesty's own initiative.—*German Under Secretary of State,* p. 7.

Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and are perhaps even now on Belgian soil. This act is contrary to the rights of nations.—*Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg,* p. 8.

The treaty guaranteeing Belgian neutrality is only "a Scrap of Paper."—*The German Chancellor,* p. 10.

Might makes right.—*Treitschke,* p. 84.

Who opposes me I will crush to pieces.—*The Kaiser,* p. 45.

The Prussian kings have given their country a great doctrine, the doctrine of militarism.—*Dr. Karl Lamprecht,* p. 53.

Take no prisoners. No quarter shall be given.—*The Kaiser,* p. 57.

*All page references are to this volume; "Made in Germany."

I am Jehovah's sword. Woe and death to those who resist my will.—*The Kaiser*, p. 58.

We are and must be barbarians. . . . I hope in this war we have merited the title of barbarians.—*Major-General von Disfurth*, p. 72.

It was with my consent that the General had the whole place burned and about one hundred shot. (The real number was between two and three hundred.)—*General von Buelow*, p. 73.

I demand absolute blind obedience.—*The Kaiser*, p. 83.

It is militarism that has permitted us to do great things. Let us keep our militarism.—*Professor Niessen, Privy Councillor*, p. 84.

War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture.—*"Germany and the Next War,"* p. 158.

The whole realm of human knowledge has been concentrated in the German brain.—*Bernhardi*, p. 160.

The state is the sole judge of the morality of its own action. . . . It is above morality.—*Treitschke*, p. 169.

Ye have heard men say Blessed are the peace makers, but I say unto you, Blessed are the war makers, for they shall be called, if not the children of Jahve, the children of Odin, who is greater than Jahve.—*Nietzschke*, p. 170.

The Christian law of love applies only to individuals of the same state.—*Bernhardi*, p. 171.

I believe . . . that the proclamation of the law on Mount Sinai must not be considered as inspired of God.—*The Kaiser*, p. 174.

To us is given faith, hope and hatred, but hatred is the greatest among them.—*Dr. Fuchs, German Journalist and retired Army Officer*, p. 177.

INTRODUCTION BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT

It is a pleasure to me to write these few lines by way of preface to Mr. Sprague's book. I wish to call especial attention to what the book says about the duty of the United States, and the lamentable and dreadful failure of the United States to perform its duty, in connection with this world war. I rejoice as an American that an American clergyman should speak as Mr. Sprague does at a time when so many of those in America who claim to be the leaders of religious and philanthropic thought have occupied a position not merely futile but fundamentally immoral. For this reason I am particularly glad to call attention to Chapter IV. Mr. Sprague puts the case in a nutshell when he says that "nothing is politically right that is morally wrong" and that, as Kant says, "there can be no such thing as moral neutrality." The case of Belgium, which he sets forth at length, is one that demanded action by the United States, if America was to be true to its obligations under international law, and, above all, if it was to be true to the spirit of righteousness throughout the world. I believe it probable that the United States might have inter-

Introduction

ferred on behalf of Belgium without involving itself in the war; but I hold righteousness first and the alternative of peace or war second; and it was our duty to act on behalf of Belgium, be the consequences what they might be. As
7 Mr. Sprague shows, the American government has been derelict in its duty under international law, and, so far from being neutral, has really, by its failure to perform its duty, been of aid to Germany in destroying Belgium. Nor is the failure limited only to failure to protest against the violation of Belgian neutrality and the subjugation of Belgium. As Mr. Sprague shows, outrages of every kind, in defiance of the Hague and Geneva Conventions, have been committed by the German armies in Belgium and Northern France, on the English coasts, and against English and neutral ships; and finally our own ships have been destroyed and our own people murdered; and yet our administration has not dared to stand up for American honor, for American interest and for the welfare of humanity. I commend particularly what Mr. Sprague has written in connection with the so-called "sympathetic neutrality,"
7 which ex-President Jordan has advocated. In advancing this argument ex-President Jordan has studiously favored criminality by expressing the same sympathy for it as for its victims. He preaches for America the Gospel of national cowardice, so far as our own rights are concerned, and, as regards our international duties,

Introduction

he preaches the meanest and basest form of abandonment of morality. As Mr. Sprague says, he is profoundly silent as regards all the moral considerations involved in the war; he dares not say one word in condemnation of the abhorrent immorality, of the infamous crime and wickedness, of the guilty parties in this war. He actually says that we are not to be pro or anti anything! In other words, he takes a position as degrading as if in our internal affairs he announced that he was neutral between the white slaver and the white slaver's victim and was not "pro or anti" either the bestial creature who rapes a child or the child who suffers the dreadful fate. Mr. Sprague is quite right in saying that the action of our government, in acting on the principles thus set forth by the more abject professional pacifists, has convicted the American Republic of wrong, of cowardice; and of complicity in the worst international crime that has been committed since Napoleon's downfall a century ago.

America owes it to itself to prepare; first, so as to be able to act in its own defence; and second, so that its weight may be felt when it takes action, as it ought to take action, in order to fight for righteousness and for the good of others, of humanity at large, if the need should arise; and it owes it to itself to prove by such action that it repudiates the base and evil doctrine which would teach us that a nation does its duty by observing a timid and selfish neu-

Introduction

trality between right and wrong, even when the right is absolutely clear and when the wrong represents every possible variant of international crime.

(Signed) THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Oyster Bay
Long Island, N. Y.
August 16th, 1915

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
I. "MADE IN GERMANY"	1
II. OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE ARMAMENTS .	30
III. GERMAN MILITARISM	52
IV. THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY .	101
V. GERMAN CULTURE	158

CHAPTER I

“MADE IN GERMANY”

We do not mean merchandise, but the war. “Made in Germany” is the proud trade-mark that bespeaks quality. “Made in Germany” will be the historical mark that will designate the most Titanic and Satanic war our planet has witnessed. The hosts of Xerxes at Thermopylæ numbered two and a half million. At Issus, Darius had an army of six hundred thousand, while Alexander never commanded over one hundred and thirty-five thousand troops. The armies of both Cæsar and Pompey at Pharsalia numbered only seventy thousand. Napoleon invaded Russia with six hundred thousand troops, while the combined armies at Waterloo numbered less than two hundred and fifty thousand. Now Europe trembles beneath the tread of seven million soldiers bent upon slaughtering each other.

The responsibility of beginning the war is greater than any nation can bear. The hysterical attempts of German apologists to exonerate their country does them credit, for the historian of Germany will point out this bloody blotch on her escutcheon and exclaim with Lady Macbeth, “It will not out, O, damned



CHAPTER I

“MADE IN GERMANY”

We do not mean merchandise, but the war. “Made in Germany” is the proud trade-mark that bespeaks quality. “Made in Germany” will be the historical mark that will designate the most Titanic and Satanic war our planet has witnessed. The hosts of Xerxes at Thermopylæ numbered two and a half million. At Issus, Darius had an army of six hundred thousand, while Alexander never commanded over one hundred and thirty-five thousand troops. The armies of both Cæsar and Pompey at Pharsalia numbered only seventy thousand. Napoleon invaded Russia with six hundred thousand troops, while the combined armies at Waterloo numbered less than two hundred and fifty thousand. Now Europe trembles beneath the tread of seven million soldiers bent upon slaughtering each other.

The responsibility of beginning the war is greater than any nation can bear. The hysterical attempts of German apologists to exonerate their country does them credit, for the historian of Germany will point out this bloody blotch on her escutcheon and exclaim with Lady Macbeth, “It will not out, O, damned

"Made in Germany"

spot!" Undisputed testimony compels this verdict.

The triple alliance of Germany, Austria and Italy confronts the triple entente of Great Britain, France and Russia. If either of these nations is attacked by one of the other group, both groups or all the six nations are involved. This is so well understood that if one nation is determined upon war no amount of diplomacy can avert it; but diplomacy can—and in this case does—show what nation was determined upon war. This does not imply that other nations were wholly free from blame. The trademark "*Made in Germany*" does not mean that all the constituents of the article are of German origin, but that the article as a completed product and put upon the market is German. So of this war: "*Made in Germany*" does not mean that other nations are not more or less contributory, but that the war, as a completed product, was put upon the world by Germany.

The tragedy at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914, was incidental and a mere pretext. Austria, previously incited by Germany, sent an ultimatum to Servia making ten demands. Servia assented to nine and offered to arbitrate the tenth. No fairer proposition could be made. Upon receiving this answer Austria hesitated, as well she might, for she had no longer cause for war.

At this juncture Austria and all the world turned to Germany. One word from her

"Made in Germany"

would halt all war proceedings. Would she speak that word? Alas, no! The German ambassador at Vienna said, "As for Germany, she knew very well what she was about in backing up Austria-Hungary in the matter." Germany's "White Paper" says, "We assured Austria that any action considered necessary to end the movement in Serbia would meet with our approval. She (Serbia) had led Europe to the brink of a world war . . . we would not advise our ally to take a yielding attitude." The war sure to follow these words may justly be labelled, "Made in Germany." Austria began at once to mobilize, as did Russia, Serbia's ally. All Europe is now trembling. Sir Edward Grey in his heroic efforts for peace has about persuaded Russia and Austria to meet in a peace conference with other nations. Hope springs up everywhere at the prospect of peace which would have filled the world with joy, when "lo! impossible to believe, Germany refuses to enter this conference of the nations Germany not only precipitated the war but she desired it."

Upon Germany's refusal to participate in the proposed conference upon technical grounds, she was asked to suggest some other method for conference but declined to do so.

The civilized world condemns "Austria's brutal ultimatum and indecent precipitancy toward Serbia." No government could submit to it and continue independent, and yet

"Made in Germany"

Germany promptly characterized it as "equitable and moderate." This accords perfectly with her purpose of war.

The triple alliance applies only to defensive warfare. On this ground Italy refused to support Austria. Germany, therefore, was under no obligations to assist Austria; but she hastens to assure her of support.

Germany, unable longer to conceal her purpose of attacking France, comes into the open and asks England if she will remain neutral on condition that Germany will promise to acquire no French territory in Europe. When asked if she would make the same promise respecting French colonies, she declined to do so. France then was to be conquered and deprived in part or in whole of her territories. This proposal to betray her ally and stand by and see France ruined filled England with surprise and indignation and she promptly rejected the proposal.

At this time, July 31st, Germany made a preposterous demand upon Russia. Russia had mobilized her troops in the lower districts to assist Servia against Austria and assured Germany that she would not mobilize against Germany or attack her unless Germany took the offensive. In spite of this assurance, Germany, on July 31st, addressed an ultimatum to Russia demanding that she demobilize all her troops, and demanding an answer within twelve hours; unless Russia complied Germany

"Made in Germany"

would mobilize her troops on the Russian and French frontiers.

By this act the die was cast. Three things are to be noted in this demand by Germany. First, Germany exceeded her rights in this ultimatum. No government has a right to demand that another sovereign government demobilize its troops. If Germany really wanted peace, instead of this unwarrantable demand followed by a declaration of war, she would have proposed that both governments demobilize. Second, the time limit of twelve hours in which to answer was impossible, as Germany well knew. Third, this ultimatum made the war inevitable, and it was "Made in Germany."

The utter emptiness of Germany's claim that she is acting only in self-defense and fighting for her life, is seen in the way she treated the offer of England to come to her defense in case of attack. Sir Edward Grey while pleading with her for peace, uttered these most remarkable words: "If you will only preserve the peace of Europe, I will endeavor to promote some arrangements, to which Germany shall be a party, whereby she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, or ourselves jointly or separately." Germany virtually assured of protection by Great Britain even if the latter had to break with her allies and act "separately"! For any "arrangement" that could give such "assur-

"Made in Germany"

ance" must involve the possibility of acting "separately" if need be. Germany promised the support of England against the world if she will only pursue a course whereby the "peace of Europe can be secured"! All honor to Sir Edward Grey for these oracular words inspired by the Prince of Peace. They present to Germany the crucial test of her sincerity regarding peace. How does she receive them? She ignores them and declares war.

That Germany made the war is settled at once and forever by the frank admission of the emperor himself. On August 4th, the Kaiser declared from the throne as follows: "*The present situation arose from ill will existing for years against the strength and prosperity of the German empire.*"

It is not then the tragedy at Sarajevo, nor Servian agitation, nor the Austrian ultimatum, nor Russian mobilization, nor all of these together that is the real cause of "the present situation," but "ill will against German prosperity"; Germany resents this "ill will"; she will not allow a feeling of "jealousy" on the part of other nations, and so will punish them by making war upon them.

This reason for war is utterly inadequate and puerile, as shown by the "great strength and prosperity" of Germany, which have developed side by side with this alleged "ill will," no instance of which the Kaiser deigns to specify. If it has been so harmless in the past how does

"Made in Germany"

it suddenly become a bogey? The question unmasks the real purpose of Germany, which is conquest and power.

This is just as clearly brought out in the Emperor's speech at the palace before the assembled thousands. He said, "*Envious people everywhere are compelling us to our just defense.*" Defense? No attack by anybody is hinted at. No invasion, no hostile act, no threat from anyone, no injury to her interests which are so prosperous as to excite the admiration and envy of the world, and yet Germany must spring to her "just defense"—against what? Why, "envious peoples everywhere." To punish them she will drench Europe in blood.

The point now, however, is that this clear and unqualified admission of the emperor shows that the war was "Made in Germany." We can safely go a step further on the highest authority; the German under secretary of state for foreign affairs said, on July 26th, "*This step was taken on his majesty's own initiative.*"

GERMANY'S ATTITUDE TOWARD TREATIES

A treaty is a solemn contract between nations. The great treaties of Europe begin as follows: "In the Name of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity," or "In the Name of Almighty God." It is the most sacred contract mankind can make. It is more binding than the marriage contract or covenants concerning private property, since all civilization, all prog-

"Made in Germany"

ress in the world, human or divine, depend upon it.

Such a treaty existed between Belgium and the governments of Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria and Russia. In this treaty Belgium agreed to be neutral in case of war between these parties, and they each agreed to keep out of Belgium and help her keep the others out in case of invasion. Thus Belgian neutrality was guaranteed. Germany was under special obligation to respect this guarantee since she had, through Bismarck in 1870, expressly renewed it and in writing. This obligation was distinctly recognized by the German chancellor, who on August 4th, said in the Reichstag, "Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and are perhaps even now on Belgian soil. This act is contrary to the rights of nations." Fatal admission, whereat history will pause.

France, trusting to Germany's promise, had left her northern frontier unprotected. Germany would take advantage of this trust and the defenseless frontiers by attacking France through Belgian territory. Accordingly Germany now requests England to become neutral and to violate her agreement to guarantee Belgian neutrality, and to allow Germany to do the same by moving her armies through Belgium and using it as a basis of operations in making war against France. England, profoundly moved and indignant at the vicious

"Made in Germany"

character of this request, promptly refuses to repudiate her solemn international obligations by betraying Belgium and sacrificing her own self-respect and honor.

Sir Edward Grey now requests France and Germany to say whether they will respect their guarantee of Belgian neutrality. France answers yes; Germany, no. Germany now sends an ultimatum to Belgium saying that she cannot respect the latter's neutrality, but is about to make use of her territory in attacking France. Germany adds that she will respect Belgium's sovereignty and make good all losses unless she offers resistance, in which case Germany will treat her as an enemy.

This message struck Belgium with amazement, indignation and terror. Under the palladium of neutrality she had for seventy years enjoyed peace and prosperity. She was now stunned at the perfidy of Germany in demanding that she violate her sacred promise of neutrality, allow her soil to become the theatre of war, and shamefully betray France, one of the signatories to the treaty guaranteeing her neutrality.

Belgium did not hesitate a moment. She refused Germany's demand and declared that she would defend her "rights by every means in her power."

Just here dates speak louder than Germany's protestations of desiring and seeking peace and show her purpose of war and her responsibility

"Made in Germany"

for beginning it. Belgium received Germany's ultimatum August 2nd; she replied August 3rd; Germany attacked her August 4th. German troops, therefore, must have been marching towards Belgium before Germany deigned to give any notice of her purpose.

This contempt of Belgium, this utter oblivion of treaty obligations and the rights of nations staggers the world: indeed, the German chancellor declared that this treaty which guaranteed Belgian neutrality was only "a scrap of paper."

In the councils of nations what weight can hereafter attach to the promises of Germany? Gladstone's admission that a "particular position" might exempt a guarantor of neutrality from participating in a war to enforce it, a doctrine that the newer Christian ethics renders more and more untenable, has no application to this case. Germany's only excuse is "military necessity"—the very exigency the treaty was designed to meet.

In a treaty between sister nations Germany solemnly appeals to the "Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity" to witness her sincerity and fidelity in the performance of its stipulations, and then, when it suits her convenience, she calls that treaty "a scrap of paper," tramples it in the dust and plunges Europe in a sea of blood. Has any nation, ancient or modern, civilized or savage, ever presented to the human race a more revolting example of moral apos-

"Made in Germany"

tacy? The blessings of peace, the horrors of war, the sanctity of treaties, national honor, international law, the claims of humanity and the behests of the Almighty, render this cruel and wanton violation of Belgian neutrality an insult to civilization and the highest crime known to mankind.

GERMANY'S SECRET PREPARATION FOR WAR

When Germany's troops had penetrated Belgium and France, certain soldiers were heard to exclaim, "It seems natural to be around here again." It seems that these soldiers had been detailed months before to visit these places and find out the condition of the roads, the places where supplies could be had, the means of shelter for troops, etc.

Several years ago the Germans, under pretence of digging wells or laying foundations for factories, made concrete platforms in the country before the Maubeuge forts. Somehow these factories did not go up; but when at length the bugle sounded for war, the factories placed on these platforms took the shape of monstrous cannon of longer range than those of the forts. Thus the forts were helpless and obliged to succumb.

The British embassy at Washington officially declares what indeed is well known, that under pretext of commerce, Germany "since 1906 has established an elaborate network of strategical railways leading from the Rhine to the Belgian

"Made in Germany"

frontier through a barren, thinly-populated tract, deliberately constructed to permit of the sudden attack upon Belgium which was carried out two months ago."

According to the London Times, "an intercepted letter addressed to the commander of the German gunboat Eber . . . contained instructions from Berlin, dated June 14, 1914, a fortnight before the Sarajevo murders, revealing a complete system for coaling the German navy on the outbreak of war, through secret agents in Cape Town, New York and Chicago." If this be the fact it shows that neither the Sarajevo tragedy nor any other grievance of Austria against Serbia furnished anything more than a pretext for a war which Germany was determined to make.

For years Germany has carried on a spy system in Belgium and France so elaborate and extensive as to be almost incredible. Thousands of spies scattered through these countries and ostensibly acting as business men or laborers, have been busy in obtaining exact information of large and small details which are now in the possession of German officers and are of the greatest value to the invaders. For example, these officers have a list of rich men in every city whom they select as hostages. They have an estimate of the ready money in every city, know where every horse and ton of hay can be found, where every river can be forded and where every bridge is located. It is now re-

"Made in Germany"

marked "that at the end or near the end of many bridges having strategic importance there was a German factory." In France it is said "the Germans know how many bottles of wine may be expected in each locality."

Of course a country providing for a strictly defensive war may employ spies, but a government that will carry on such a spy system as this in other countries at great labor and expense is looking for compensation only in one way, and that is by aggressive war.

We do not know what secret correspondence took place between Germany and Austria prior to the war, but Germany now publishes a "White Paper" that shows that she alone instigated it. It says, "We assured Austria that any action considered necessary to end the movement in Serbia . . . would meet with our approval." It advises Austria "not to take a yielding attitude" toward Serbia, even if it "should bring Russia into the field" and "*involve us in a war.*" Could Germany have employed language more inflammable? Germany was behind Austria's ultimatum to Serbia and Austria was her willing tool; otherwise she never would have thus challenged both Serbia and Russia. It is because the word "war" was first on German lips, because she first advised it, secretly planned for it and took the first steps to bring it on, that we say the war was "*Made in Germany.*"

"Made in Germany"

THE ALLIES DID NOT MAKE THE WAR

The horrors of war have led to the indiscriminate censure of all the nations engaged in it. This is unjust and foolish. War is not the only hell nor the worst one. Unrighteousness or injustice is worse than war. The peace-at-any-price doctrine is immoral and is opposed to the Christian religion, and, as all experience shows, only postpones the conflict. "First pure (righteous) then peaceable" is the injunction of the Scriptures.

Nations as well as individuals, alone or allied, innocent of wrong-doing, may fight in self-defense, but only as a last resort and after every effort for peace has failed.

The allies did not make this war; it was made upon them by Germany that spurned every overture of the allies for peace. We do not say that the allies have not made preparations for war in the past, or have done all they could to promote peace, or that they are better or worse than their enemies. It is admitted that past conduct, causes and influences are more or less responsible for the war, but, although German apologists drag these things into the discussion, they are irrelevant. The issue is single. If two men are arraigned for fighting and it appears that one began a deadly assault upon the other in spite of the latter's earnest request for a peaceful settlement, the court will find the aggressor guilty. The court will not listen

"Made in Germany"

to former jealousies and animosities between the parties, but will decide the case upon its own merits and the immediate facts, and will find the aggressor guilty. He who threatened violence, refused peace and struck the first blow will be declared guilty, while the attacked, no matter how hard he hits back, will be declared innocent.

ENGLAND DID NOT BEGIN THE WAR

Chancellor Lloyd-George was earnestly urging a reduction of armaments on the very day Austria sent her ultimatum to Servia.

Winston Churchill's voice was raised eloquently to induce Great Britain to reduce her navy; but when Germany would not agree to any reduction, he felt that England had no choice but must be prepared.

Sir Edward Grey's efforts to prevent war were heroic.

Austria's ultimatum to Servia was on July 23rd. The war began ten days later, August 2nd. During those ten days according to The Outlook, Sir Edward Grey sent no less than forty-seven telegrams and letters, in the interests of peace, to English representatives at the capitals of Europe. This would make four or five letters a day or one every two hours for each of the ten working days of eight hours each. He asked Servia to give Austria the fullest satisfaction if her charges were true; he urged France, Germany, Russia and Italy to

"Made in Germany"

p. 5 join England in a combined effort for peace. All promptly assented except Germany which declined. Still undiscouraged Sir Edward Grey declared himself ready to join the four powers in any method looking for peace and pointed out the great danger of war. As the danger drew on he made one last supreme bid for peace by a virtual promise to Germany of England's assistance in case of need. Germany had declared that her only object was self-defense against the impending attacks of enemies. Sir Edward Grey now promised Germany that if she would keep the peace, he would "promote an arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia or ourselves jointly or separately."

Although Germany ignored these words, which left her without a shadow of excuse for war, the world will not forget them. No sublimer words were ever heard in the parliaments of the world than these uttered by Britain's great statesman and peacemaker. They show conclusively that England did not want war; she did not expect it, was not prepared for it and was the last to engage in it, and then only to fulfil her solemn international obligations, to protect a weaker and worthy nation from destruction by a more powerful one and to preserve her own self-respect and honor.

"Made in Germany"

RUSSIA DID NOT BEGIN THE WAR

All European nations knew of the entente between Serbia and Russia, and that Russia would not allow either the territory or sovereignty of Serbia to be impaired. When, therefore, on July 24th, Austria sent her impossible ultimatum to Serbia and demanded an answer within twenty-four hours, Sazonof, premier of Russia, on the same day asked Austria to extend the time in order that the Powers might have an opportunity to consider the matter. Austria refused. On the 26th, Sazonof appealed to Italy and Germany to influence their ally, Austria, in favor of peace. The next day he accepted England's proposal for a conference of the powers—or any other method that promised peace. The next day he twice telegraphed England urging her to influence Germany for peace. The next day he telegraphed Germany that the Russian mobilization was not against Germany nor did it indicate aggressive measures toward Austria, and urged a conference of Germany, France, England and Italy, and also one between Austria and Russia, to secure peace. Both Germany and Austria refused. The next day he telegraphed England that Russia would adopt any measures England might suggest for peace. On the next two days—July 30th and 31st—he telegraphed Germany, France, Austria, England and Italy, that if Austria would consent to stay the march of

"Made in Germany"

her armies on Servia, and would allow the powers to consider what reparation Servia should make to Austria without impairing her sovereignty, Russia would cease her military preparations. Austria again refused her consent to this proposal. On the next day Germany declared war against Russia, because Russia refused to demobilize her troops.

The above named efforts of Russia to secure peace are effectively summarized in The Outlook of October 7, 1914.

A careful perusal of the "White Papers" of both England and Germany and the Russian "Orange Paper," all official documents, will convince any unprejudiced person that the war was not begun by Russia. On the contrary Russia did everything that a peace-seeking nation could do to prevent war.

When the Austrian troops first attacked the Servian army, the latter, to the surprise of all nations, declined to fight and "fell back." It now appears that this was done at the request of Russia in order to give the powers further time for a peace conference. Russia even went so far as to declare that she was "quite ready to stand aside and leave the question in the hands of England, France, Germany and Italy."

FRANCE DID NOT BEGIN THE WAR

France had the least to say and was next to the last to act of any state engaged in the war.

"Made in Germany"

It was, however, well understood that France and Russia were bound to act together. This explains the determination of Germany first to crush France and then turn her attention to Russia. France had given no cause for war. She was not thinking of war and was unprepared for it. This is admitted by the German ambassador at Vienna, who said, "France, too, was not at all in a condition for facing war."

England asked the powers to meet in conference to stay the war. To this request France replied, "Your proposal is accepted by the French government."

When Great Britain demanded of France and Germany to say whether they would respect the neutrality of Belgium, France said, yes; Germany said, no. Dr. Frederick Lynch, secretary of the Church Peace union, was in France and Germany when the war broke out, and he passed through Liege two days before the German attack upon it. In his "Through Europe on the Eve of War," he says, "The French had made no move up to this time and were still trying to secure peace by negotiations with the other powers."

In no country, not even in the United States, is the anti-militarist sentiment so strong as in France. Among all classes various organizations and groups of men, clericals, educators, workmen and statesmen have for years been opposing war with such determination as to em-

"Made in Germany"

barrass and alarm the government. The Confederation of Labor with its 500,000 paying members, the Federation of the Teachers' Benevolent association numbering 100,000, the socialists groups with 100 members in parliament, have all united in an anti-militarist propaganda that has demoralized the army, and defied the government. It was felt that the first shot fired in war might be the signal for another commune. A writer says in view of this feeling throughout France that "nothing short of actual invasion of her territory by German troops could have compelled France to take an active part in the European conflict."

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY THE CAT'S-PAW OF GERMANY

What Austria did to bring on the war was as the agent or cat's-paw of Germany. Austria's ultimatum to Serbia shows a grievance, but it does not show a sufficient cause for war; and if it did, it was entirely removed by Serbia's answer.

Austria well knew that war with Serbia meant war with Russia, Serbia's ally. That Austria, single-handed would challenge forces that could promptly swallow her up, no one believes. The French claim that "the German emperor forced Austria to fight when she was willing to submit her differences with Serbia to an international conference."

Germany's "White Paper," page one, unconsciously discloses the fact that she herself is

"Made in Germany"

the real cause of the war. This "paper" says, "It was the idea of Russian statesmen that there should be formed a Balkan league . . . against the existence of the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy." Then the part each Balkan state was to play is set forth. "The Austrian-Hungarian government advised us of this view of the situation and asked our opinion in the matter . . . we were able to assure our ally most heartily of our agreement . . . and that any action she might take . . . would receive our approval. We were fully aware that . . . any warlike movement on the part of Austria-Hungary against Serbia would bring Russia into the question and might draw us into a war . . . Our interests were also seriously threatened . . . if Serbia with the help of France and Russia had been allowed to imperil the existence of Austria, she would be no longer an ally on which we could count against the attitude of our eastern and western neighbors, which has constantly grown more threatening . . . We, therefore, gave Austria a free hand."

It was this secret "advice" given, we know not when, and which may be the only part Germany deigns to make known, that pushed the button that set the war in motion. Germany was ready and the Sarajevo tragedy furnished the pretext.

That Austria was merely a cat's-paw, is conclusively shown by the Kaiser's own admission before quoted: "The present situation arose

"Made in Germany"

from ill will existing for years against the strength and prosperity of the German empire."

A WAR OF CONQUEST TO BE "MADE IN GERMANY"

For a generation such a war has been predicted and advocated in Germany. German scholars, statesmen and militarists have been educating the people to believe that aggressive war, conquest for German national expansion, dominion and glory, was in harmony with the laws of nature and of nature's God.

Americans who have occasionally noticed such sentiments from German sources have dismissed them as sporadic and chimerical. We now stand aghast at the fact that they represent a philosophy held by foremost German scholars, a national policy held by the kaiser, bureaucrats and militarists, a philosophy and a policy that are responsible for the war and that completely dominate Germany in this crisis.

Christendom is now startled at the discovery that a philosophy so subversive of religion, so repugnant to Christian ethics, so antagonistic to the new spirit of peace and good will toward men, in a word, so thoroughly pagan, could obtain in scientific, cultured and progressive Germany.

In 1875, Heinrich von Treitschke became professor of history in Berlin and also a member of the Reichstag. His brilliancy attracted to his

"Made in Germany"

lecture room "a dense throng not only of students, but of soldiers, writers, officials, all the intellectual leadership of Germany." Having just conquered France the people were glorying in their prowess and the fruits of victory. The professor taught such doctrines as these: "That the strong should triumph over the weak is an inexorable law of nature." The idea that weak nations have a right to live "cannot for a moment be allowed to check the career of German conquest. Why talk of founding colonies? Let us take Holland; then we shall have them ready made." "God will see to it that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race." The downfall of England and the harvest of loot that could be reaped was a worthy object. His words are, "Germany with 60,000,000 virile people should address herself to the downfall of England . . . and then of what an inheritance to take possession!" These ideas appealing to passions that can be aroused far more readily than they can be allayed, took possession of German universities, schools and influential groups of people and spread over the land.

Dr. Hans Delbrück, professor and editor, declared that "Germany was bound to expand at the expense of one and all of the three great powers, England, France and Russia. . . . It is the mission of Germany to save Europe and Asia from the rule of the Muscovite."

Prof. Wilhelm Ostwald of Leipsic university

"Made in Germany"

says, "The way to have peace is to have Germany victorious. She should crush England, and break up Russia and reduce France to vassalage." We should have taken this sentiment lightly before the war, but now we see that it was uttered with a seriousness that is nothing less than deadly.

Three years ago Gen. Friedrich von Bernhardi wrote a book on "Germany and the Next War." It is the textbook of German militarism. It created consternation in England and France. We quote: "War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture as well as power." "War is a biological necessity of the first importance." "Might makes right." "What is right is dictated only by the arbitrament of war." The Christian law of love "applies only to individuals of the same state and has no significance for the relations of one country to another." "The idea that a weak nation has the same right to live as a powerful and vigorous nation is subversive of human development." "Wars deliberately provoked have had the happiest results." "A sacrifice to an alien nation is immoral." "France must be so completely crushed that she can never again cross our path." "An expression of German power is a political necessity . . . it must be fought and won." For Germany, "it is either world power or downfall." "Her attitude must be offensive and aggressive at the start."

"Made in Germany"

This book appeared three years ago and declared that the time to proclaim the war would be 1914. It sounds like history rather than prophecy. It is the Bible of the dominating militarism of Germany. Its brutal principles and inhuman doctrines have been and are being followed to the letter by the Kaiser and his advisors. The wonder is that they waited so long before beginning the war.

Last year a German retired military officer wrote in, "On War of Today," "I hope the German people will assert and maintain itself as the dominating race of Europe."

The German philosopher, Nietzsche, in his "War and the People" says, "You should use peace as a means to new war and brief peace more than a long one. Do you say, 'It is a good cause by which a war is hallowed'? I say unto you it is a good war which hallows every cause. War and courage have done greater things than love of one's neighbor."

General von Edelsheim of the Prussian general staff, recently published a paper in which he pointed out the method which Germany in its conquest of the world, would pursue in attacking the United States. He says, "The Germans have to ask themselves what force they can bring to bear in order to meet the attacks of the United States against their interests and to impose their will."

In 1880 von Moltke said, "Perpetual peace is a dream and it is not even a beautiful

"Made in Germany"

dream. War is an element in the order of the world ordained by God. Without war the world would stagnate and lose itself in materialism."

The Belgian "Gray Paper" shows "that Belgium tried to be in league with Germany three years ago. It tried to obtain from the German government a declaration that Germany had no intention of violating Belgian neutrality." The request was refused. A distinguished writer says, "The attack on Belgium had been carefully planned for a score of years."

Professor Muensterberg in his, "The War and America," eulogizes war, saying, "Only war can adjust the power of countries to the changing stages of their inner development." "It is the grossest immorality" for Americans to say "that nations should respect the possessions of other nations."

Prof. John Warbeke, for three years a student in a German university, says, "The rank and file, as well as the aristocracy, from laborers and small shopkeepers, petty officials and students to judges of the supreme court and university professors who have become secret counsellors, not only in Berlin and Bonn, but in Munich and Heidelberg, all have become ominously full of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest and the consequent expediency of power, not only in intellectual rivalry, but in Krupps and high explosives."

"Made in Germany"

For more than a generation German children have been taught in school and by all the multiplied influences in both public and private life that impress the plastic mind of youth, that the chief end of man was to glorify, not God, but the army and war. Obsessed with this idea and duped with the utterly false belief that millions of enemies stood on their borders with bristling bayonets about to burn their homes, sack their cities and destroy their native land, the German soldiers entered upon the war.

Prof. Roland G. Usher of Washington university, at St. Louis, published a year ago his "Pan-Germanism," wherein he asserts that Germany's purpose might "at any moment result in a war whose consequences would be felt alike by the farmers in North Dakota, the operators in the Lancashire cotton mills and the savages in the heart of Africa." This was written a year before the war and describes the exact state of things today. He goes on to say, "The Germans aim at nothing less than the domination of Europe and of the world by the German race . . . it is an aggressive scheme for the actual, forcible conquest of the world." This ~~German~~ author has attracted wide attention for the clear, dispassionate exposition of Germany's purpose and program. He tells us that "in the German navy it is customary to drink to a toast, 'To the Day,'" and that the toast "means not only the destruction of the British empire and the disruption of the

"Made in Germany"

French republic, but also the domination of the world."

Dr. Ernst Richard, a German, says, "The Germans are determined to win at any cost, and after their victory to leave their enemies in such shape that they will never be able to disturb the peace again." In other words they must be permanently subject to Germany. The note of vindictiveness and malice in this utterance is even more disturbing than its idea of conquest.

The German Admiral Hermann Kirchoff writes under date of September 4th, "England must be crushed. But is this possible? Indeed it is . . . German military and naval forces are now ready to throw themselves on England and destroy it by all means at their disposal by water, in the air, and on the land."

The German professors Eucken and Haeckel of Jena issue an appeal to American universities for sympathy based on culture. They say, "These universities know what German culture means to the world, so we trust they will stand by Germany."

German pagan intellectual culture, as a substitute for Christian ethics will appeal in vain to American Christian scholarship and ethical culture. With Americans an ounce of righteousness is worth a ton of culture.

We are not now, however, concerned with the moral character of the sentiments expressed in the foregoing citations by representative Ger-

"Made in Germany"

mans. What we do say is this: that any nation holding these views, viz., that might makes right, that neighborly love ceases at the state line, that "blood and iron" are preferable to conference and peace, that the size of a nation determines its right to exist, that a treaty is only "a scrap of paper;" and to uphold it is "hypocrisy"; that respect for the possessions of other nations is the "grossest immorality," that militarism is superior to morals; that its "place in the sun" requires it to put all other nations in the shade by force of arms; that killing men is "a biological necessity"; that culture rather than righteousness exalts a nation and that Mars is the only true God; any nation we repeat dominated by these views, is bound to make war and such a nation has made this war.

Eleven representative Germans have now issued a pamphlet, "The Truth About Germany," which says, "*The kaiser had the moral courage to assume the responsibility of beginning the conflict.*" History will accept this declaration that the war was "*Made in Germany.*"

CHAPTER II

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE ARMAMENTS

Armaments mean equipments of war, such as troops, munitions and warships. There is much shallow thinking and consequent confusion concerning them. Probably most Americans regard great armaments as an evil, while small armaments may be a good. The difficulty of drawing the line between great and small armaments leads some to reject them altogether, while the views of others are as wide apart as the poles.

THE PRINCIPLE OF ARMAMENTS

This principle is that for the protection of life and property, the necessary means may be employed. The principle applies to individuals as well as to nations. It is the principle of self-preservation, everywhere regarded as a law of nature.

In the case of nations these necessary means are called armaments; in the case of individuals no one word covers the various means employed. A lock on the door, the fastenings and iron shutters on the windows, the burglar-proof safe, the massive, walled-in vaults for valuables,

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

the steel vest worn by the man whose life is threatened, these and other devices, as well as the small sword and pistol are the armaments of the individual.

The clamorous denunciation of armaments would be more effective if it did not overlook the principle involved. It is clearly inconsistent for a man to denounce all means of protection and then proceed to lock his doors against burglars. This brings us to an important distinction.

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE ARMAMENTS

In applying the principle of armaments to individuals, the examples given were for purposes of defence. So in the case of the nation, we must distinguish sharply between offensive and defensive armaments. The failure to do this, the indiscriminate condemnation on the one hand, and praise on the other of armaments, regardless of the uses for which they are designed, has led to all sorts of misapprehensions and vagaries. In the past offensive war and armaments have not only been tolerated but praised; to-day, however, they are not only an anachronism but an outrage against our civilization. Defensive armaments, on the other hand, are not only justifiable but absolutely necessary.

Only three hundred years ago Cavendish wrote as follows; "It has pleased Almighty God to suffer me to circumpass the whole globe

"Made in Germany"

of the world . . . I navigated along the coasts of Chili, Peru and New Spain where I made great spoils. All the villages and towns that ever I landed at I burned and despoiled, and had I not been discovered upon the coast, I had taken great quantity of treasure. The Lord be praised for his mercies." The sweet simplicity and earnest piety of the pirate add luster to his exploits. To-day no sentiment could be more abhorrent at least outside of Germany. No sentiments were ever more repugnant to true religion.

This entire change of the world's attitude towards offensive armaments is one of the greatest triumphs of Christianity. There is no better evidence of this change than the emphatic manner in which the warring nations in Europe disclaim responsibility for beginning the war; that is, for the offensive use of their armaments. On the other hand all nations approve of defensive armaments.

Washington, far in advance of his time, at least in the old world, voiced the true principle of Christian ethics and statesmanship respecting war, in the inscription he placed upon his three swords still hanging upon the wall at Mount Vernon. It reads as follows: "These swords are accompanied with an injunction not to unsheathe them for the purpose of shedding blood, except it be for self-defence, or the defence of the country or its rights, and in the latter case to keep them unsheathed and to

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

prefer falling with them in their hands to the -
relinquishment thereof."

DEFENSIVE ARMAMENTS A NECESSITY

This necessity will continue so long as nations are liable to wanton attack and spoliation by others.

All instruments of war however humble are armaments. David's sling and five smooth stones were the armaments with which he conquered Goliath and put to rout the enemy. Canonicus, Sachem of the Narragansetts, sent to Miles Standish a bundle of arrows wrapped in the skin of a rattlesnake; Captain Standish returned the skin stuffed with powder and balls. These simple weapons constituted almost the entire armaments of the colonists. In 1776 Washington's little army, confronting the British at Boston, was in imminent danger from the want of powder. At length Washington received an armament of one hundred barrels of powder, and when the curtain rises again, Howe and his troops are evacuating Boston with a dispatch that only powder can inspire.

The kind and size of defensive armaments will depend upon varying conditions. Our great forts, our giant Dreadnoughts now being equipped with sixteen inch cannon, the largest in the world and with a range of sixteen miles, and with twice the penetrating power of the German howitzers that made havoc of

"Made in Germany"

Belgian forts, afford no better protection to-day than did these simple armaments of the colonies.

The necessity for defensive armaments is recognized by the Christian Scriptures which contain our organic law, and upon which our political constitutions are founded, and conformity to which, according to Blackstone, alone gives validity to human laws.

The passages of Scripture which are quoted as opposed to the principle of armaments may be summed up in that one which says, "Resist not evil." But the same authority says also, "Resist the Devil." Defensive armaments alone enable us to "resist the Devil" in his most hideous form of offensive war.

The same divine authority that said to Peter, "Put up thy sword," says to all his disciples, "He that hath no sword let him sell his garments and buy one"; that is, it is better to go naked and possess a sword, than to be clothed without one.

The ultra-pacifists who decry all armaments unqualifiedly are reviving the doctrine of non-resistance. This doctrine springs from one lobe of the heart acting independently not only of the other, but of all the other faculties of the mind. It is indefensible. It makes government impossible and puts a premium on injustice; it rewards violence and punishes virtue; it is unnatural, irrational and leads to social anarchy.

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

DEFENSIVE ARMAMENTS HINDER WAR

The defensive armaments of a nation tend to restrain other nations from attacking it. To the extent of this restraint defensive armaments are a hindrance to war.

Most of the great armaments of Europe were designed for defence only. What has been their effect on war in general? Have they promoted peace or war? Peace most assuredly. Pacifists are right, however, in demanding disarmament of all nations, but they are wrong in demanding that one nation shall disarm, leaving itself a prey to other armed and predatory nations.

Modern huge armaments date from about 1870. *Prior to that date wars were far more numerous than since.* This is a simple historical fact. The evolutionist will tell you that primitive man, as destitute of weapons as the denizens of the forest, waged unceasing warfare. The Temple of Janus at Rome, kept open in time of war and closed in time of peace, was closed but once in five hundred years. The Franco-German war was in 1871, the Crimean war in 1854, the Italian war in 1859, the Russo-Austrian in 1866, our own civil war in 1861. The blood of five million men was poured out in the First Empire; sixty thousand men were killed and wounded in our war of 1812; since 1815 France has had twenty wars not one of which was due to modern armaments. Indeed, before the era of great armaments wars were almost

"Made in Germany"

of daily occurrence. It may be truthfully said that as armaments have increased wars have decreased.

Other agencies have contributed to this result. The spirit of brotherhood abroad in the earth, the great and beneficent peace movements, the Hague conferences, the humanities of the Gospel of Christ—all these have helped; but no one can successfully deny that the tendency of defensive armaments has been to hinder war.

It is claimed that the very possession of defensive armaments breeds a war spirit. Even so, it does not follow that they should be abolished. The very possession of money or other things breeds a tendency to misuse them; but the right use of them may more than counterbalance this tendency. Pistol toting tends to fighting and so far is an evil, but woe to the man who disarms himself when all about him are armed and some of them avowed robbers. The remedy is not to stop one man but all men from the evil practice. One writer says that "an army or a navy are no more an incitement to war among reasonable men than a policeman is an incentive to burglary or homicide."

If a nation is incited to war by its armaments, it is also restrained by the armaments of the enemy. The incentive and restraint tend to counterbalance each other, and were the tendencies equal, their armaments would neither

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

conduce to peace nor provoke war. That the tendency to restrain is stronger, is historically shown by the constantly decreasing number of wars since the rise of modern armaments.

No one more ardently desired peace than Washington, but he did not hesitate to say, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effective ways of preserving peace." He spoke in view of conditions then existing among the nations that permitted war upon unoffending people for conquest, territorial expansion and plunder. Precisely such is the war Germany is now waging upon the other countries of Europe. Until these conditions are changed any departure from the words of Washington is suicidal.

OFFENSIVE ARMAMENTS ASSURE WAR

Since offensive and defensive armaments differ only in respect to their use, it may be said that this is a distinction without a difference. On the contrary, the distinction is so vital that no intelligent discussion on the subject is possible without it. With equal consistency one might say that a pistol designed to be put under one's pillow, is to be regarded in the same light as when it is designed for murder.

How can we tell when a nation is designing its armaments for offensive war? The answer is simple. When such armaments exceed the needs for defence. For years Germany has been preparing such excessive armaments.

"Made in Germany"

Some of the reasons for this statement are as follows:—

(1) Her leaders claim that Germany began the war with armaments sufficient to carry it on for five years. No other nation makes any such claim. In fact the allies had not sufficient equipment for one month of war.

(2) She probably has at this present time more armaments than Great Britain, France and Russia combined, and it may be more than all the world besides; not of a single class like warships, but of the total of all instruments of war. She is said to have had four and a half billion rifle cartridges in stock when the war began, enough to depopulate the earth if three bullets for each individual could do it. In addition to this she had on hand five hundred million pounds of explosives.

(3) She has already supplied large quantities of munitions of war to Austria and Turkey.

(4) She is actually able with the aid of Austria to cope with the three greatest powers of Europe.

(5) Great Britain, France and Russia, possessed at the outbreak of the war with defensive armaments only, are now buying arms from the United States, and Russia is also buying from Japan.

(6) Germany has the Krupp plant for manufacturing arms which has heretofore exceeded in capacity, equipment and efficiency those of

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

Great Britain, France and Russia, and possibly all of Asia, Africa, North and South America combined.

The main plant at Essen occupies 1,200 acres, of which 235 are under one roof, employing 39,000 men. Branches at Rheinhausen, Duisburg, Neuwied and Engers employ 15,000 more. The dockyard at Kiel occupies 55 acres and employs over 6,000 men. 10,000 are digging coal at Annen and Gruson, and 5,000 more are mining for iron. This makes a total of 75,000 employes with a pay roll of \$25,000,000 annually, which would be nearer \$50,000,000 in the United States.

Within the last fifty years this plant has sold tens of thousands of guns to fifty different nations. In all the world nothing like this was ever before seen.

(7) This is not a tithe of the magnitude and costliness of the German armaments. Add to it her military railroads, arsenals, warships, baggage trains, commissariat, motor vehicles, Zeppelins, electrics, ambulance wagons, intrenching implements, her vast quantities of accoutrements for millions of soldiers, and her conscript system forcing every able-bodied man into military service in time of peace.

The point is not that Germany has armaments, but that their vastness is far in excess of her needs for defence, and that they were designed for aggressive war. Behind these armaments there is a type of militarism permeating

"Made in Germany"

the entire social organism, including the church, as rampant, malignant and demoniacal as ever prevailed in ancient Rome or Sparta.

(8.) Listen to German leaders and calculate the effect of their words upon offensive armaments. Treitschke said, "Why talk of founding colonies? Let us take Holland, then we shall have them ready made . . . Germany with 60,000,000 of virile people should address herself to the downfall of England." Again, Delbrück says, "Germany was bound to expand at the expense of England, France and Russia." ^{p. 23} Professor Oswald says, "Germany should ^t crush England, break up Russia, and reduce France to vassalage." These are not isolated but representative declarations and accord perfectly with the vast offensive armaments of Germany which made war inevitable.

DEFENSIVE DISTINGUISHED FROM OFFENSIVE WAR

A nation must defend its sovereignty, its territory, its citizens, its property, its sacred honor and those rights and privileges upon which these depend.

The aggressor in war is not necessarily the nation that first declares war or strikes the first blow, but the one that violates the rights of another nation and takes up arms in support of such violation. A violation of rights may be so indirect, or so complicated by circumstances, that the nature, extent, as well as the fact itself, of such violation, may be difficult to determine.

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

In such case or whenever the nations in disagreement cannot settle the dispute in a peaceable manner, the one refusing the proposal of the other to arbitrate the matter and resorting to arms, is ordinarily the aggressor.

It is here assumed that the standards of right and wrong that obtain between individuals and in civilized states, shall be the same between nations. Unless we can postulate this, we have no foundation for international law; unless this single standard can be adopted as a sure basis of all international proceedings, war is inevitable and peace a dream. A group of nations under agreement to act together in case of war, when such agreement is made known, must be regarded as a single unit in the matter of offensive or defensive war. That is, the act of one is the act of the group; a war upon one or by one is a war upon or by the group to which it belongs. If, however, the terms of the agreement apply only to defensive war, then the aggressor alone is responsible.

In the present war Italy declined to act with Germany and Austria because the triple alliance was for defence only, while Germany and Austria were waging an offensive war. It is a matter for profound gratitude that Italy refused to join Germany and Austria in their attack upon Belgium. By such refusal she escaped the odium of Germany and her apostate Chancellor in pronouncing a treaty, the most solemn instrument known to mankind, to be a mere "scrap of

"Made in Germany"

paper," a sentiment so abhorrent, so ghastly in its consequences, that it may well be regarded by the civilized world as a second fall of man in the Eden of the twentieth century. Belgium presents a perfect example of a nation engaged in defensive warfare. Germany presents a perfect example of a nation engaged in offensive warfare.

INCREASE OF OFFENSIVE ARMAMENTS BY ONE NATION REQUIRES AN INCREASE BY ALL

Simple as this truth is, it is denied or ignored by ultra-pacifists. How can we tell whether an increase of armaments is for offensive war? This should not present a difficult problem for diplomacy. Suppose all nations likely to be at war with each other are at peace. Now if one nation makes the first move to increase her armaments, beyond a proportionate increase of national growth, it means in nine cases out of ten sooner or later an aggressive war. Suppose in addition, this nation, through her leaders, openly avows her purpose of aggressive war, then it is certain the armaments are for aggression. Suppose again, that neighboring nations shrinking from war and the burden of maintaining armaments, request this nation to discontinue her excessive increase of armaments, assuring her of their peaceful intentions, and she refuses their requests; this refusal points to offensive war. Suppose once more, that this nation refuses to join other nations in

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

the reduction of armaments; such refusal means but one thing and that is offensive war. There are other signs of the aggressive purpose of an increase of armaments, such as the declarations of leading men, and above all the tone and extent of militarism in the nation.

We yield to none in aversion to war. We have been in the midst of its indescribable horrors and would like to see all armaments sunk in the sea, but we are utterly unable to understand how the nations can dispense with armaments, while one nation is increasing its armaments and openly avows its intention of making war upon other nations, and reducing them to subjection, and that her policy is one of "blood and iron," of conquest and power.

This is precisely Germany's attitude. She has repeatedly refused the request of her neighbors for a reduction of armaments and kept on piling them up, until to-day she is able to defend half a dozen Germanies against attacks from any source. Neighboring nations must either increase their armaments or perish at the hands of Germany. There is absolutely no alternative. Her leaders loudly proclaim this policy of conquest and the principles by which alone it can be sustained. "*War is in itself a good thing,*" says Bernhardt. "*The state is justified in making conquests.*" *Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful and vigorous nations.*" "*Might makes right.*" "*Huge armaments are in themselves desirable.*" For

"Made in Germany"

a generation these diabolical sentiments have been taught to the children in German schools. t. Professor Oswald says, *"Germany should crush p. 24 England, break up Russia, and reduce France to vassalage."*

When these principles materialize in enormous armaments and declarations of war against neighboring nations, we repeat, the latter must either increase their armaments or perish. One leading writer says, *"We are going to destroy England . . . and we will not rest until we have gained our object."*

It avails nothing for German apologists and their American allies to say that these views do not represent the German government, while they are being carried out to the letter, in the most illegal, cruel and inhuman practices of the German troops.

What is the duty of nations whose existence is thus threatened, especially when they see the most extensive preparations being made to carry out this threat? Failure to provide defensive armaments would be suicide.

What would now be the condition of the allies had they not increased their armaments? Belgium is the answer. The object of Germany as stated by Professor Oswald would have been realized and England "crushed," Russia, "broken up," and France would be a "vassal" at the feet of Germany. Their armaments at this moment alone are preserving their liberties and their lives.

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

Suppose Germany wins this war, what of the United States? For years Germany's naval toast has been, "Der Tag," "To the Day," which means the day when Germany shall embark upon the conquest, not only of England and France, but of the world. Her shibboleth is "World Power or Downfall." The Kaiser is God. His brother, Prince Henry of Prussia, thus writes him: "I have but one motive, a desire to proclaim to the nations the gospel of your majesty's sacred person and to preach it to those who will listen and to those who will not." Listen to the Kaiser himself: "The crown was bestowed upon me by the grace of God alone and not by the parliaments and meetings and decisions of the people." And again, blasphemously paraphrasing the words of Christ, "One is your Master even Christ and all ye are brethren," he says "Only one is master of this country That is I. Who opposes me I will crush to pieces."

Suppose this Kaiser victorious over the countries of Europe, and with his Alexandrian motto of world conquest, turns toward the United States, will our pacifists cry out, Away with armaments! Dismantle your forts! Intern your ships; Lie down and with brotherly love let the German juggernaut roll over you, crushing out your liberties, your lives and your republic, the "last effort of divine Providence in behalf of the human race"?

We have built the Panama Canal at a fabu-

"Made in Germany"

lous cost with the primary object of national defence. As such it is the greatest piece of armament the world has ever seen. We have before us a pamphlet by one of our best men decrying all armaments and saying, "We have squandered millions of dollars on fortifications in the Philippines . . . and we are about to squander other millions in Panama. . . . Armaments are not guarantees of peace; they are not insurance; they are not instruments of righteousness or reason have faith in brotherhood. Believe in love." We do believe in love and brotherhood but what does the writer mean? Would he really have the Canal filled up, or allow a brigand power to rob us of it and take possession or put it out of commission? Does he regard the money it has already cost as well as the money it will have cost for protection as "squandered"? In denying that armaments "guarantee peace" does he really think that disarmament by the United States would "guarantee peace" and "insure" us against invasion? Disarmament by one nation would not only not "guarantee peace" *but would guarantee war by inviting any nation bent on conquest to attack us.*

The millennium will come, but it is not at hand nor even in sight. As yet the nations are on a competitive, military basis. Competition itself has come to mean war. The most military nation sets the pace that the others must follow or perish. So long as a single powerful nation

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

is free to multiply offensive armaments and make war, all other nations will be compelled to arm, weaker nations to ally themselves with stronger, and alliances, ententes, balances of power and spheres of influence will be absolutely necessary.

There is, however, one alternative to which men are hopefully turning. This is an international tribunal to determine disputes, enforce decisions and abolish all armaments except such as may be necessary for an international police force to coerce a recalcitrant nation. This method of suppressing evil accords with all human and divine laws and is approved by the experience of mankind.

Material and moral forces have now as never before reached a point of development and unity where they combine to make such a tribunal possible. To its accomplishment the United States should officially take the lead, bend every energy, employ every agency and if need be appropriate not merely millions but billions of dollars.

Ultra-pacifists would object to the use of armaments by an international police force to keep the world's peace, since they decry all armaments upon which, in the last analysis, such force must rely. We cannot agree with them. A policeman relying on brotherhood or love to stop a thief or stay the hand of a murderer would be regarded as demented.

When all Germany is singing, "The World

"Made in Germany"

with Germany on Top," which means with the Kaiser as king and "blood and iron" as prime ministers, it would be criminal folly for the United States to abolish her defensive armaments.

Defensive armaments are not condemned in the Scriptures. Christ himself approved of defensive weapons. He said, "I came not to bring peace but a sword," that is, conflict-war between eternally hostile principles. Christ was the "Captain" of "good soldiers" as well as "Prince of Peace." *The peace He promises is not acquiescence in wickedness but victory over it.* That peace is coming, but at present the fight is on.

Whenever armaments are used for the sake of power, conquest, revenge or the lust of "blood and iron," they are offensive armaments. On the other hand, when used for the protection of a nation's rights they are defensive armaments.

GOVERNMENTS NOT INFLUENCED BY THE COST OF ARMAMENTS

Arrays of figures showing the enormous cost of armaments in the different nations are startling. The last year before the war Germany spent \$294,000,000, France \$311,000,000, Russia \$440,000,000 and England \$480,000,000. All the nations together, it is estimated, spent about \$3,000,000,000 on their armies and navies. The withdrawal of men from productive labor is

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

said to have cost \$3,000,000,000 more, making a total of \$6,000,000,000 spent each year on armaments. Counting at the rate of sixty per minute, eight hours per day, and three hundred and sixty-five days per year, it would take one man six hundred years to count this sum. This is the cost on a peace footing.

We are told that Germany and Russia are now spending \$15,000,000 a day each, France and Austria \$10,000,000 each and England at the same rate, to carry on the war. We cannot realize these figures nor is it necessary. Nobody is really influenced by them. No government gives them very serious attention.

The cost of armaments is not a tithe of what the nations spend for luxuries in countless directions. The play-house and music bill, the tobacco and liquor bill of any nation far exceeds the cost of its armaments, although the latter is regarded as a thousand times more important. If every German laborer carries a soldier on his back, he also carries drones and luxury mongers.

No, the cost of armaments, however tremendous, has scarcely a feather's weight with any government. No matter how burdensome it may be, or how exacting the conscription laws, or how they grind the people least able to bear the burden, *the matter of cost will never cause the reduction of armaments so long as nations depend upon them for existence.*

The real objection to armaments is the ob-

"Made in Germany"

jection to war itself. Armaments are a symbol of war. War means not only cost in money, but suffering, wounds and death, lamentations unutterable, and woe.

In the social evolution a stage has been reached when needless human suffering will not be tolerated. This is the fruit of Christianity. It has been a long time in coming. It is due to the new sense of universal brotherhood and love. It has come to stay. It recognizes war as its arch enemy. War therefore must go. But its one prop is armaments. Then down with armaments of every description! The logic is imperfect, but the sentiment is divine and we will work for this consummation. Meanwhile let us live and not die. While struggling toward the harbor let us not scuttle the ship.

It is often said that when the nation's money and credit are exhausted it cannot get armaments and must stop fighting. No mistake could be greater. A self-supporting nation like Russia, for example, can wage war indefinitely without money or foreign credit. Powerful as these are they are not indispensable. A nation may live by exchange of goods or payment in kind. It may use any commodity as a medium of exchange among its own people. Nations have lived thus in the past. Such industries as would sustain life and supply arms could be carried on without money. Money is a convenience, not a necessity either in peace or in

Offensive and Defensive Armaments

war. Mexico and Turkey show how nations may carry on war long after their money is practically exhausted. How large should be a nation's defensive armaments? What is preparedness? That depends. Many factors enter into the problem. The circumstances of each nation are to be considered.

The United States is now anxiously asking this question. It is not a partisan one. We believe our statesmanship at Washington will answer it wisely, so as to ensure our own safety on the one hand and on the other, assure the world of our supreme love of peace and eternal hatred of aggressive war.

CHAPTER III

GERMAN MILITARISM

If militarism has heretofore meant a disposition to provide armaments for national defence together with the exaltation of military affairs, it has been gradually acquiring another meaning more in accordance with its essential character. By militarism we now understand the martial spirit, or the fighting propensity together with the desire and effort to supply all the means of gratifying it. It is essentially the love of war, the murderous disposition, the savage instinct, the lust of blood.

All these qualities can be veneered with civilization and refinement. They are perfectly at home in the drawing room and sit complacently, prayer-book in hand, in a partially paganized church.

Militarism has no desire to be defined in this manner. The Christian religion, if anything, is a religion of brotherly love. Militarism is hatred. Christianity has made such strides within a century and now looms so large in the earth, that militarism dares no longer face it and so hides its hideous features under various masks, such as national defence, the mili-

German Militarism

tary virtues, preservation of peace, impending danger of attack from a foreign power, etc.

Germany is the one exception to this statement. She has the distinction of being the only nation that now extols militarism, not only as a virtue but as the corner stone of her national greatness and glory. This is the cause of the war.

Jingoes in other countries are comparatively few. In Germany militarism is an institution of the state and the paramount one. Germany has been almost the sole promoter of it in Europe. Russia has always followed, never preceded, Germany in the matter of armaments. Temporizing writers seek to spread the plague about equally over the different nations, but all Germany rebukes them. Dr. Karl Lamprecht of the university of Leipsic says, "Our great trump cards are Luther, Goethe and Kant. The Prussian kings to be sure were heroes . . . and have given their country a great doctrine, the doctrine of militarism."

In view of such admissions how can an American write as follows? "There is as much militarism in covering the sea with dreadnoughts as there is in covering the land with armies." Is it true that England is to be thus ranked with Germany in the matter of armaments? Let us see.

(1) Neither dreadnoughts nor armies nor their size necessarily indicate militarism. It is the spirit and purpose behind them. If they

"Made in Germany"

are for defence only, the greatest armaments do not imply the least militarism; if they are for offensive war they imply militarism alone. Behind England's dreadnoughts there was a desperate effort to keep the peace; behind Germany's armies, a determined effort to make war.

(2) England's insular position and possessions required all her dreadnoughts for defence, while Germany's armies are ten times what are needed for defence.

(3) In view of the extent of England's coasts and colonies to be protected as compared with those of Germany, England is not as well equipped with dreadnoughts as Germany.

(4) England condemns militarism as devilish, while Germany praises it as divine.

There are militarists in every country but they are relatively a negligible quantity, while in Germany they completely dominate not only the government, but all social institutions. We will consider militarism, therefore, as it is exemplified in Germany, where it has had its most perfect development.

THE MILITARISM OF THE KAISER

Cæsar Augustus changed the Roman Republic into a monarchy and concentrated all power in himself. Kaiser is the German for Cæsar. Cæsarism is military despotism. Cæsar, after a period of peace, suddenly exclaimed, "Varus, give me back my legions!" So the Kaiser,

German Militarism

after twenty-five years of peace, every moment of which has been spent in preparing for war, suddenly exclaims, "Bethmann Hollweg, give me my legions; and as for you 'Barbarous Russia,' I give you twelve hours in which to throw up your hands!" It is not an accident that the Kaiser is called "The Over War Lord." Aggressive war is militarism in bloom.

The Kaiser glories in militarism. This war was begun by him. "The Truth About Germany," by eleven representative Germans says, "The Kaiser had the moral courage to assume the responsibility of beginning the conflict." Again they say, "We are bound to follow our Kaiser because he symbolizes and represents the nation." Diplomatic correspondence preceding the war shows conclusively that one word from the Kaiser could have prevented it. No one questions this.

The Kaiser seriously insisted that the war be localized; that is, that the fifty million elephant, Austria, and the five million mouse, Servia, be left to fight it out themselves! Again, when Russia asks him to restrain his ally, Austria, he artfully assumes that his "mediatorial offices" between Russia and Austria have been requested, when the fact was he had been addressed as one of the contending parties himself. His repeated references to "the localization of the war" and to his own "mediatorial offices" are masterpieces of diplomatic buffoonery.

"Made in Germany"

No doubt the Kaiser's peace sentiments are sincere, but his war sentiments are more sincere. Psychologically he is a nondescript. He is a sincere believer in contradictory opposites. It is a matter of history that to insult England in the Boer war he sent a message of sympathy to Kruger, and then shortly after, followed it by presenting to Queen Victoria a plan for subjugating the Boers. He champions Christianity, and then goes to Constantinople, seeks out the arch enemy of Christianity, Abdul Hamid, addresses him as "Dear Friend," looks into his eyes lusterless from debauchery, listens sympathetically to his lying lips and clasps the monster's hand dripping with the blood of thousands of massacred Armenians. In his Christian zeal he makes a pious pilgrimage to the mosque of Damascus and places there a gift on which is inscribed his admiration of Saladin, Islam's great warrior. One day he says, "I hope you will always take delight in handling the duelling blade. The real meaning of our duels is often misunderstood by the general public." The next day he says, "It is my will and pleasure that more vigorous steps be taken to prevent duels." Protesting his desire for peace, he precipitates this war with Russia. He has stoutly declaimed against the Yellow race, while now he secretly instigates the Sultan to proclaim a "*Holy War*" against his own race and religion. Note another exhibition of his mental and moral deformity: it is officially

German Militarism

stated that after kneeling down and praying beside the graves of many brave German soldiers, he rose and exclaimed, "I did not want it! I did not want it!" A little later he said, "The sword was forced into my hands by myself,—by the Germany that I created by my inspiration." When his soldiers were sent against China, this Christian Emperor charged them to take no prisoners and give no quarter. His exact words were, "*When you encounter the enemy you will defeat him. No quarter shall be given. No prisoners shall be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy.*"

This is militarism with a vengeance. The murderous disposition, the lust of blood of the Roman and middle ages, which, under the benign influence of Christianity, the world had so far overcome as to feel that no public approval of them would ever again pollute official lips, is boldly approved by the Kaiser and enjoined upon his soldiers. No other voice however imperial has in these latter days so outraged the public opinion of the world.

The most serious thing respecting these utterances of the Kaiser is his belief that they are inspired by God. Witness the following to his army. "*Remember that the German people are the chosen of God. On me, as German Emperor, the spirit of God has descended. I am his weapon; his sword; his Vicegerent. Woe to the disobedient. Death to cowards and un-*

"Made in Germany"

believers!" In the same tyrannical, blasphemous and brutal strain he charges his troops in Poland. *"I am Jehovah's sword. Woe and death to those who resist my will and to all who do not believe my mission. The enemies of the German people shall perish."*

This militaristic despot and blood-thirsty tyrant, claiming like his prototype, Caligula, divine authority and honors, is the head of a nation that we have all along supposed to be civilized and Christian, and presents a spectacle incomprehensible to the average American.

A friend of the writer was in Berlin in 1905. A great festival was held at which the Kaiser was present and made an address. The next morning the papers reported the Kaiser's speech and the streets resounded with cries of "Hurrah! the day is at hand! Keep your swords sharpened and be ready!" Yes, Mr. Kaiser, in the expressive language of the people, there is some militarism here.

There is of course a better side to the Emperor. He is not all bad. After Satan had been soundly berated at a prayer meeting, an amiable old lady remarked, "Well, I don't suppose the Devil is as bad as he might be!" We are assured that the Kaiser has a frank, open countenance, a kindly disposition and other attractive qualities. This may not be doubted. He may have the susceptibility of Cain, the musical talent of Nero and be the treasurer of

German Militarism

the church like Judas Iscariot, and still, by his all-devouring militarism, be the arch murderer of the human race and guilty of the blood of his fellow men, to a greater extent than Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne and Napoleon combined. Be it remembered that not only have hecatombs already perished, but all Europe is now trembling beneath the tread of thirteen million armed men bent on slaughtering each other; and be it further remembered that no German apologist of the war, of which there are hundreds, not even the Kaiser himself, has dared deny that he and he alone could by a single word have prevented this crime, the most ghastly save that of Calvary that the earth has witnessed.

MILITARISM IN THE ARMY

A judge in passing sentence of death on a murderer has no desire to kill, but is filled with pity. With eyes filled with tears and voice choking with emotion, Chief Justice Shaw of Massachusetts pronounced sentence of death upon Professor John *Q.* Webster. In killing their fellow men soldiers unmoved by a sense of pity and brotherhood are murderers. Organized murder is more dangerous to society than private murder and hence more abhorrent, and yet it is not only excused but applauded. W. J.

In spite of the hardening tendencies of war, multitudes have engaged in it not only without

"Made in Germany"

malice but with kindly feeling toward the enemy. Such soldiers are actuated by a sense of duty, by devotion to a righteous cause or to great principles more sacred to them than their own lives. Such was the case in our revolutionary war and in the war to abolish slavery and save the republic.

At the very antipodes of these sentiments stands the militarism of the 35,000 army officers that constitute the military oligarchy of Germany. Bismarck, whose influence began to be felt about the middle of the last century, may be called the father of German militarism. He was a great man, if a man can be called great, who at the close of his career mournfully says, "I have inaugurated great wars. I have been the cause of death to multitudes and of suffering and misery to millions of my fellow men." Bismarck admits that he brought on the Franco-Prussian war of 1871 by changing the famous Ems telegram. When he received it he was dining with von Moltke and Roon. He read it to them. They were so dejected that they ceased to eat and pushed their chairs back from the table. Then Bismarck, seeing their dejection, asked if they were thoroughly prepared for immediate invasion of France. He well knew that Prussia had long been anticipating and preparing for it. They answered, "Yes." Bismarck then took a pen and so altered the telegram that he said it would "act like a red flag to the Gallic bull." So magical

German Militarism

was the effect upon von Moltke that raising his glass, he said, "If I am permitted to lead our armies into France, the Devil may take my old carcass afterwards and do what he wishes with it." Roon, equally elated, exclaimed, "Our God will not desert us!" Murder, slaughter, the blood of their fellow men, were thus the supreme longing of von Moltke, and Roon invoked God's blessing upon the butchery.

No one now doubts that the Franco-Prussian war was made in Germany. Bismarck admits that he altered the Ems telegram. It was forgery and the most damnable recorded in history. Bismarck was proud of the perfidious act. He presents to us the perfect type of German militarism.

Within four years after the conclusion of the war, France had paid the enormous indemnity of one billion dollars imposed by Bismarck, and wonderfully restored her commerce and prosperity. Upon this Bismarck prepared to attack her again with the brutal remark that "This time we will bleed her white."

Von Moltke was Bismarck's spokesman. He had the fighting propensity, the lust of blood. His whole life was spent in killing and devising means to kill. At first the Kurds in Egypt were his victims; then the Danes and afterwards the French and Austrians. After every great slaughter he received fresh laurels from his murderous countrymen and was going higher and higher when suddenly he was

"Made in Germany"

claimed by his Satanic Majesty to whom he had consigned his "Old Carcass" when once he had drunk the blood of Frenchmen. Berlin, even with its shocking glorification of war, is disgraced by a monument surmounted with a life-sized figure of this barbarous German butcher.

The "Zabern incident" illustrates the insolent and cruel spirit of militarism in the German army.

At the end of the Franco-Prussian war, the treaty of Frankfort, May 10, 1871, tore the province of Alsace-Lorraine from France and annexed it to Germany. After forty years of separation the great majority of the people still love France and long to return to her government. They have been exasperated at the harsh and oppressive rule of the Germans and especially at the intolerable insolence and insults of the German soldiers.

Zabern is a manufacturing town of 10,000 people and is twenty miles from the French line. In October, 1913, the German garrison was under the command of Col. von Reuter. A twenty-year old lieutenant, von Forstner, insulted the French flag and said the French foreign legion was "Good enough for German deserters." He called the Alsatians "Wackes," a most opprobrious name, and "offered two dollars and fifty cents to every German soldier who would run his bayonet through any civilian who insulted him." His conduct created great

German Militarism

excitement. Women and children came out to see what he was like and pointed at him. Did Col. von Reuter reprimand this lieutenant? On the contrary he told him to use his sword the next time he was insulted and failing this he would be court-martialed. The town was now so stirred up that Col. von Reuter, in order to get all power into his own hands, and against the protest of Herr Mahl, the sub-prefect of Zabern, proclaimed martial law. He at once arrested twenty innocent citizens. The resentment increased.

On November 26, Lieutenant Schad, while intoxicated, at the head of a few soldiers, charged on a group of children and arrested a number of citizens who happened to be passing; the charge against one being that he hissed at the army when the fact was he was merely whistling.

On November 28, some school boys jeered at a squad of soldiers who then charged upon the boys. The boys got away, but the soldiers arrested everybody in sight, including a fireman who had rushed to the door at the noise. Twenty-seven persons innocent of any offence were imprisoned over night in a cold basement. The sub-prefect again protested to the Colonel that he was exceeding his authority.

On December 2, Lieutenant von Forstner was jeered at by some children. He ordered his men to seize them but they caught only a lame cobbler. Lieutenant von Forstner drew his

"Made in Germany"

sword and struck the poor cobbler over the head, cutting a gash five inches long.

The uproar was now so great that the noise reached the Reichstag. A vote of censure by two hundred and ninety-three to fifty-four was passed against the officers at Zabern. Officers Reuter and Schad were tried and acquitted. Lientenant von Forstner was sentenced to forty-three days imprisonment. On appeal this sentence was promptly revoked on the ground that he had not sharpened his sword before he slashed the cobbler's head! It will be noted that the act of the Reichstag had not a feather's weight with the military oligarchy. The Crown Prince congratulated the brutal officer.

This is the "Zabern incident." It illustrates the character of German militarism and the feeling of the German officers toward the civilians. It kindled a flame of indignation throughout Alsace-Lorraine and France.

To show that the incident was not exceptional in character but representative, we will add that Rosa Luxemburg, immediately after the occurrence, declared in print that cruelties committed by the officers occurred daily. For this she was prosecuted by the government. Thereupon the socialists presented thirty-two thousand certified cases of recent acts of cruelty and over one thousand witnesses.

The refusal of Germany to reduce armaments when requested by the nations now associated

German Militarism

as Allies shows Germany's responsibility for modern militarism. Militarism finds expression in organized and legalized murder by means of armaments. Armaments, however, designed solely for defence have not the slightest militarism behind them. Such was the case with Belgium. Certain writers tell us that by maintaining armaments all the warring nations display militarism and are responsible for the war. The plausible phrase is, "We will not undertake to distribute the blame; all are guilty." Nothing could be more unjust or contrary to the facts.

Imagine a judge saying, because a man used weapons to fight off a burglar, "We will not undertake to distribute the blame in this case, as both parties were engaged in fighting!" Germany alone with her cat's-paw, Austria, is responsible for this war. Germany alone was the aggressor. She alone was fully prepared for it. She alone began it while all the Allies were pleading with her to keep the peace. What is her object? Leading Germans answer, "First Paris then London," then Petrograd, then Rome, then Constantinople, then Washington. Foolish? Not to Germany. For years the toast in her navy has been "Der Tag," to The Day, when she enters upon the conquest of the world. Absurd? Not to Germany. Her foremost men do not deny it. Moreover, they assure us, that when Germany embarks, as she has now done, upon the conquest of the world,

"Made in Germany"

it will be on her part a strictly defensive war! Thus the end of the world for veracity and common sense would seem to have come for Germany.

Turn now to the Allies. Their armaments do not indicate the slightest militarism. The armaments of Germany indicate nothing but militarism. If Germany or any other powerful nation increased its armaments with the avowed purpose of conquest, other nations were compelled, however reluctantly, to follow suit. This is precisely what has happened. Germany has forced other nations to build up great armaments in self-defence. Take a late example. In the Spring of 1913, Germany increased her standing army by about 700,000 men. What for? Nobody had injured Germany or threatened her. France looked upon this as a direct menace to her republic, and the world now sees that France was right. Can any one blame France, when, two months later, she increased the time of military service from two to three years, thus increasing the size of her army to meet that of Germany? How did Germany regard this? She denounced it as "a provocation that ought not to be endured."

Germany has repeatedly refused the request of all the Allies for a reduction of armaments.

On February 2, 1870, France asked Germany for a simultaneous reduction of armaments. She made the request through Lord Clarendon, British Foreign Secretary, who wrote Germany

German Militarism

as follows: "It is in the general interests of Europe, of peace and of humanity, that I desire to invite the attention of Count Bismarck to the enormous standing armies that now afflict Europe—a state of things that now withdraws millions of hands from productive industry and heavily taxes the people . . . that no thoughtful man can contemplate without sorrow and alarm, for this system is cruel, it is out of harmony with the civilization of our age, and it is pregnant with danger."

How did Germany receive this overture? Without a moment's hesitation, Bismarck rejected the proposal. It was really the proposal of England as well as of France.

Sir Edward Cook in "How Britain Strove for Peace," tells of her efforts to allay German militarism as follows. In 1895, England sought an alliance with Germany. "The Salisbury cabinet was returned to power and showed a marked desire for a rapprochement with Germany. The stumbling-block was the new ambition of William II to grasp the trident." Any entente between Germany and England would have tended to allay German militarism by a reduction of naval armaments which laid a tremendous tax upon both nations.

Again in 1911, Herr von Rath, Councillor of Legation, wrote as follows: "To-day it cannot be denied that England strove in the first instance for a political rapprochement with Germany and that Edward VII pursued this policy

"Made in Germany"

as soon as he came to the throne." These failed, says Sir Valentine Chirol, because Germany demanded an alliance to break the Monroe Doctrine to which England would not consent.

In 1898 Russia proposed to Germany and England a naval reduction. Germany again not only refused but increased her navy.

In 1906 Great Britain proposed a naval reduction but Germany refused to consider it.

Again in 1907, Sir Campbell-Bannerman, British Prime Minister, appealed to Germany for a naval reduction. The appeal was met by the refusal of Germany even to take part in a general discussion.

Once more in 1908, Edward VII visited the Kaiser and tried to make an Anglo-German agreement to reduce naval armaments. Again Germany refused. Four observations are now in order:—

(1) All the Allies have striven for a series of years for an alliance with Germany to allay her militarism, by a naval reduction.

(2) Germany has refused every such overture. She has not only made no proposal herself, but has refused even to take part in a general discussion of the subject.

(3) The Allies at length clearly understood the position of Germany, viz: that she gloried in that execrable thing called militarism and was only waiting for an opportunity to display it.

German Militarism

(4) That man who says of the warring nations, "One is just as guilty of militarism as another," or, "We cannot distribute the blame for this war," or, "All alike have trusted to armaments to keep the peace," is either ignorant of the facts or an apologist for crime.

The truth is, no nation has trusted to armaments to keep the peace. On the contrary Germany has trusted to armaments to make war, while the Allies have trusted to them as a means of preserving their existence.

The essential nature of militarism is illustrated in the treatment of the Hereros of South Africa by the Germans. A government expert on colonization was recently called upon to instruct the Reichstag. He said, "The Hereros must be compelled to work, and to work without compensation and in return for their food only. Forced labor for years is only a just punishment, and at the same time it is the best method of training them. The feelings of Christianity and philanthropy, with which the missionary works, must for the present be repudiated with all energy."

Ten years ago General von Trotha, the German Governor, issued a proclamation as follows:—"The Herero people must now leave the land. If it refuses I shall compel it with the gun. Within the German frontier every Herero with or without weapon, with or without cattle, will be shot. I shall take charge of no more

"Made in Germany"

women and children, but shall drive them back to their people or let them be shot."

The result of this brutal order, says Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, was that "many thousands of them were slain, and thousands more were driven into the desert, where they perished of hunger and thirst. And yet they are described by a reputable writer as intelligent, vigorous, industrious, alert and adaptable."

Poland has experienced much the same cruel and inhuman treatment at the hands of the Germans. It is true that other nations, especially Russia, have been guilty, but for the most part the cases are few and exceptional, whereas it is the cumulative aspect of the brutal qualities of German militarism that gives it its ghastly distinction.

Another feature of German militarism now commands the indignant attention of the civilized world. It is the reversion to barbarous methods of warfare.

Once, long ago, prisoners of war were killed or enslaved, women and children outraged and slaughtered, civilians put to death, private property confiscated or destroyed, and towns and cities reduced to ashes.

Gradually certain rules of warfare mitigating its horrors were adopted by all civilized nations. Prisoners were spared and exchanged, women and children were protected, notice to non-combatants to leave preceded the bombardment of towns and cities, civilians

German Militarism

were unmolested and private property was respected.

These humane conditions indicate a mighty triumph of Christian civilization; not indeed the final goal which is the abolition of war, but vast strides in that direction.

But now comes Germany like a monstrous dragon with crested head, scaly armor and terrible claws, and wantonly tramples upon these merciful conditions and boldly reverts to the cruel practices of the barbarian and the savage.

Among these practices of constant recurrence thus far in the war are the killing of civilians, burning and sacking of towns and cities, or assessing enormous sums of money upon them and demanding hostages in pledge of payment, bombardment of unfortified places, dropping of bombs from air craft and strewing floating mines upon the open sea.

KILLING, BURNING AND PLUNDERING

An illustration of German relapse to barbarism is seen in their treatment of captured towns and cities. They have made a charnel house of Belgium. Churches, schools, houses and hospitals are in ruins. Entire villages are wiped out. In Louvain one-third of all the buildings are destroyed; among them 1,074 dwellings. In the suburbs 1,823 houses are burned. Cathedrals and works of art of priceless value are destroyed. The Rheims Cathe-

"Made in Germany"

dral was not spared. This monument of mediæval faith and art, of surpassing beauty and grandeur, held sacred by all the world, was laid in partial ruins by the invaders.

"In the Louvain group of communes one hundred and seventy-six persons, men and women, old men and sucklings, rich and poor, in health and sickness, were shot or burned." The case of Louvain illustrates that of many other places. This is not war, since the foe had been vanquished. It is butchery, and the blood of the slain calls aloud from the ground to the God of justice.

The denial of these acts of savagery only adds lying to cruelty. They accord perfectly with the type of militarism of which Germany boasts.

Major-General von Disfurth writes, "*We are and must be barbarians. For my part I hope that in this war we have merited the title of barbarians.*"

Before showing how this "hope" is being realized, let us say that we do not overlook the kind-hearted, peace-loving disposition of the great mass of the German people. We admit the admirable qualities of the Kaiser and the sincerity of many German apologists, and we dismiss, as not proved, the charges and counter charges by Germans and Belgians of certain atrocities, such as the cutting off the ears and noses and putting out the eyes of the wounded; but all this has nothing to do with the spirit

German Militarism.

and practice of the brutal militarism of the army and the military oligarchy in absolute control of the treatment of captured cities.

We have before us copies of proclamation after proclamation, issued by the Germans in Belgium, giving the exact words, dates and official signatures. One of them posted in Hasselt on August 17, 1914, says, "In cases of civilians shooting on the German army, a third of the male population will be shot": that is, for the action of a half-crazed man trying to protect his home and for which the people are in no way responsible, one-third of the men and boys of the city will be summarily shot! This not only violates the laws of war, but is expressly forbidden by the Hague convention.

A few patriotic Belgians tried to defend their homes in Ardenne. Listen now to General von Buelow, commander. "It was with my consent that the General had the whole place burned and about one hundred shot." The inhabitants say that more than two hundred were shot, while four hundred have mysteriously disappeared, and all the houses were burned down for a distance of more than eight miles beyond the town.

At Namur on August 25, a proclamation was posted which said, "Every street will be occupied by a German guard who will take ten hostages for each street. If there is any rising the hostages will be shot."

"Made in Germany"

On August 27, General von Buelow imposed upon the town of Wavre \$600,000 and said, "The town of Wavre will be set on fire and destroyed if payment is not made when due."

These are samples of proclamations posted in many places. They are plain historical facts which any one can verify. They are so contrary to the rules of civilized warfare, so cruel, blood-thirsty and devilish, that all Christendom and all decent heathendom should hang their heads in speechless shame and indignation. Thus the militarism of the German army converts it into "A horde of barbarians and a band of incendiaries."

Leading Germans say that Belgian civilians fired on and otherwise assaulted German troops and the severe measures of the latter were only in self-defence. Three things are to be said in answer:—

(1) *The Hague convention says, Captured towns and cities shall not be punished or held responsible for the acts of private citizens toward their captors.*

(2) *"German law expressly requires German civilians to attack and harass an invader by every form of night and secret attack."* How then can it be a crime for Belgian civilians to treat invaders exactly as Germany commands her citizens to treat invaders? On what ground can Bernstorff, Dernberg and Co. justify these outrages by saying that u,

German Militarism

“The Belgians got only what they deserved?” “Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee.”

(3) Belgian civilians did not fire on the invaders. Even should there be an exception, the charge in general is false. Repeatedly has Germany declared its war policy to be, to loot, to burn, to murder. *“Every act of whatever nature committed by our troops for the purpose of discouraging, defeating and destroying our enemies is a brave act and a good deed.”*

So speaks Major General von Disfurth. So speak, only a hundredfold louder, the many authenticated acts of the German army.

BOMBARDMENT OF UNFORTIFIED PLACES

The disregard of recognized rules of war is shown by the German navy in the bombardment of unfortified towns and cities.

The Hague convention says, *“The bombardment by naval forces of undefended ports, towns, villages, dwellings or buildings is forbidden.”* In all cases previous notice should be given that civilians may escape from the danger zone.

In spite of the Hague convention a German squadron on December 16, 1914, made a raid on the English coast towns of Scarborough, Whitby and Hartlepool. The latter is a commercial port with light defences and may be

"Made in Germany"

legitimately attacked, but Scarborough and Whitby are seaside resorts without defence. The Germans stealing up in a dense fog and without a moment's notice rained upon the inhabitants their death-dealing missiles. One hundred persons, mostly civilians, were killed and three hundred wounded. Of the killed seventy-seven were in Hartlepool, seventeen in Scarborough and fourteen in Whitby. Among the wounded were many women and children. One infant of four months had its skull broken while in its mother's arms. Germany was frantic with delight at this fiendish exploit against defenceless towns. She regarded it as a great naval achievement and applauded these slayers of women and babies as "Heroes."

BOMBARDMENT FROM THE AIR

The same rule applies to Zeppelins and aeroplanes as to warships. It matters not whether the bombardment is from the water or the air. Unfortified places are exempt and if fortified, civilians are entitled to notice. This novel mode of warfare seems to be regarded as legitimate. Bombs may be dropped upon the enemy's troops, forts, arsenals, warships and all other armaments, but not upon unfortified towns and non-combatants. This is forbidden by the rules of war and the common conscience of mankind.

In defiance of these rules the Germans have dropped bombs upon many unfortified towns

German Militarism

and cities and killed and wounded hundreds of men, women and children. A single attack of these raiding air craft illustrates their general character. On January 19, 1915, the Germans made an aerial raid upon England, attacking Yarmouth, Cromer and other towns. They came in the night and the darkness was so thick that but few saw them. The royal residence at Sandringham was specially marked for destruction. In Yarmouth several workingmen's homes were destroyed as also other buildings. Three harmless non-combatants were killed and others wounded. On another occasion Zeppelins on a still night dropped a few bombs into the streets of Antwerp and killed perhaps twenty inoffensive men, women and children.

This is not the act of civilized warfare. It is the act of barbarians. No enemy is put *hors de combat*. No military advantage is gained. Indeed this is not the object. The object is to destroy, terrify and murder. It is prompted by hatred, revenge and lust of blood. It is not a military proceeding and the perpetrators if caught should not be treated as prisoners of war, but as private individuals guilty of murder in the first degree.

FLOATING MINES

There is something paralyzing in a sea fight between great war vessels. The weapons are so monstrous, the fight so terrific and the consequences so appalling, that we shudder as we

"Made in Germany"

contemplate it. And when the great ship receives its mortal wound and takes its final plunge into unknown depths, carrying with it hundreds of brave men, we stand aghast with horror. This, however, is legitimate warfare. A floating mine is not a legitimate weapon. It is a device of Satan. We are not speaking of mines sunk in a harbor to protect a city and which are controlled from the shore and are designed solely for defence; we speak of those mines floating broadcast, and contact with which means instant death and destruction to men and vessels, not of an enemy only but of neutral nations. The latter's vessels sailing the open seas where they have a right to sail, carrying cargoes which they have a right to carry, engaged in necessary and peaceable commerce, are suddenly and without an instant's notice torn asunder and sunk in the sea. Already Sweden has lost eight ships and with them sixty lives . . . Denmark has lost six ships and six lives, Holland three vessels and fifteen lives. The loss of property in these disasters has been ten million dollars. The losses of Great Britain in men and property greatly exceed the total of these neutral nations above mentioned. A great passenger steamer from the United States grazed a mine off the coast of Ireland and barely escaped going to the bottom.

The strewing of these mines is a dastardly crime against humanity, no matter by what

German Militarism

nation it is done. The man or nation found guilty of it should suffer the severest penalty that can be inflicted.

MILITARISM IN GERMAN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

We have defined militarism as the fighting propensity, the murderous disposition. These qualities being no longer in good repute are masked under such virtues as bravery, heroism and patriotism.

For a generation militarism has been taught the children and students of Germany under the guise of these virtues and especially under the guise of loyalty to the Kaiser. They have been taught to believe that other nations were so envious of German prosperity, that they were preparing to invade their country and lay it in ruins; that the time was at hand when hordes of "Russian barbarians, frivolous Frenchmen and perfidious Englishmen" would swoop down upon Germany, devour its substance, burn its towns and villages, devastate its fields and kill its inhabitants. One thing and one thing alone could save their country; that was the sword.

The effect of such teachings upon the plastic minds of youth can be imagined. War was the thing to look forward to. War was ordained of God and the Kaiser. Children must love it. They must learn how to hate their enemies and kill them. Now for the irony of it all!

"Made in Germany"

No such envy of Germany existed among the nations. No nation was preparing to attack Germany. No threats were made from any source. No invader was on her frontiers or desired to be. It was all an unmitigated falsehood, a cunning device of militarism, for militarism and by militarism. It let loose in the minds of youth the base passions of hatred, malice and murder that are the elements of militarism, but which, by skillful manipulation, can assume the form of pure patriotism.

Some years ago an American educator was visiting the schools in Germany. He was surprised to find that in the study of geography, the pupils were required to locate the important forts on the frontiers of Germany. They were required "to tell the exact value of these forts from a strategic and military point of view."

The pamphlet, "The Truth About Germany," by Professors Harnack, Wundt, Lamprecht and others says, "We have been forced to become a nation of soldiers in order to be free." The Germans "have been brought up under the shadow of the feeling that revengeful neighbors were waiting for the hour to burn their villages and their towns." "This dread every German has known from his childhood days." "Professor Münsterberg testifies that his conscious life began with a vivid image of Hussars returning from the Austro-Prussian war, that his first writing was a childish poem about war, and that when he was a student at Heidel-

German Militarism

berg there was no other talk, 'but the war which the French restlessness would force upon us.' "

An Englishman investigating German educational methods, asked a bright boy what he would like to do when he grew up. The boy's hand flew to his head in military salute as he answered, "To take London for the Emperor, Sir." Here is the fruitage of Treitschke's words, "Germany with 60,000,000 virile people should address herself to the downfall of England . . . and then what an inheritance to take possession of!" The boy's answer shows a degree of progress in education that must please the Kaiser who had said, "The army is an incomparable school for the education of the people."

The answer indicates another thing, viz., the deification of the Emperor as the "Over War Lord." This claim to divinity the Kaiser practically makes when he says, "*I received my crown from God. On me as German Emperor the spirit of God has descended. I am his weapon; his sword; his Vicegerent.*" "*There is only one law, my law, the law which I myself lay down.*" Again he says, "*The best word is a blow—the army and navy are the pillars of the state. . . . I rely firmly and securely on my army.*" Children and youth, however amiable by nature, cannot listen to such sentiments, especially from one whom they regard as the most exalted being on earth, without having

"Made in Germany"

their minds poisoned with the deadly virus of militarism.

The average American, wont to regard Germany as a model in educational matters, is now surprised and pained to learn that, in the place of Christian idealism which was formerly the basis of education, she has substituted a crass materialism.

This has not been brought about by the German people but by the Kaiser, the military oligarchy, and the pagan philosophers. Schools and universities have been taken in hand by the military state which has curtailed their freedom and made them a part of the military machine. "A dozen years ago," says the Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican, "Dr. Wolf von Schierbrand told how public education in Germany was suffering from an attempt to curtail academic freedom. 'The Prussian minister of education openly declared it to be the main mission of the university to train young men into good servants of the state and of the monarchy.' " That is, for the army. "The whole spirit was changing in German schools and universities. Among the boys and young men a spirit of bold utilitarianism was rampant. The present generation of young men has discarded old aims and ideals . . . the change is most profound among the university students. They too are the most loud-mouthed jingoes, the blind admirers of unscrupulous success."

German Militarism

Two facts explain the militarism of German universities and professors. One is thus stated by Professor Münsterberg: "In the German view the state is not for the individuals, but the individuals for the state." This means that the state is something apart from the people—a thing that the people really have nothing to do with. Their part is simple obedience—as the Kaiser says, "absolute, iron, blind obedience." This is despotism. The American view is that the state is for the individuals, or rather the state is the people politically organized. The state and individuals are thus one. This is liberty.

The other fact is, as already suggested, that the German university and its professors are largely controlled by the state. In Prussia full professors are appointed by the sovereign himself. They are paid by the state. They are officers of the state. "The complacent professor is decorated, the contumacious is cashiered." The Kaiser has rewarded and punished them at will.

These two facts, the autocratic theory of the state, and the political control of the universities, fully account for the attitude of German professors respecting the war. They are a part of the government. They belong to the military machine and must serve it. We are not surprised, therefore, that the most virulent and loathsome phrases of militarism have originated with German historians and philosophers.

"Made in Germany"

The historian Treitschke laid down the vicious doctrine that "Might made right." "Among all political sins the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible. It is the political sin against the Holy Ghost." The philosopher, Nietzsche, taught militarism in this fashion: "Ye have heard men say, Blessed are the peacemakers, but I say unto you, Blessed are the war makers." Professor Münsterberg says, "I admit that the hostility which Germany is finding to-day in all parts of the world was created by the development of German militarism; but it was just that militarism which constitutes one of the most significant expressions of the German power of organization or social efficiency." Haßden, an influential German journalist, writes, "Not against our will and as a nation taken by surprise did we hurl ourselves into this gigantic venture. We willed it." This is the will to power, taught by Nietzsche who died insane while his doctrines live insane.

In the same strain Professor Niessen, privy councillor, writes, "It is militarism that has permitted us to do great things. Let us keep our militarism. It will enable Germany to retain her position, to rise from disaster. If we win let us cultivate militarism to the utmost in order to preserve the fruits of victory." This purpose to "cultivate militarism to the utmost," after either defeat or victory in the present war, is a proclamation of war *in perpetuum* against the nations of the world. The

German Militarism

thought of it is paralyzing. It leaves three courses open to the Allies. They must either continue the war until German militarism is annihilated; or, peace being made, leaving it in force, they must immediately renew the policy of huge armaments in preparation for war; or lastly, the nations must form a league of peace backed by a police force strong enough to compel Germany to disarm. We will add only one other testimony which is truly representative. Ninety-three German authors, scientists and artists have issued an appeal in which they say, "It is not true that the combat against our so-called militarism is not a combat against our civilization as our enemies hypocritically pretend it is. *Were it not for German militarism, German civilization would long since have been extirpated.*"

What an admission! "German civilization" founded on "German militarism"; which is hatred, murder, the lust of blood! How obsessed the intellect, how atrophied the heart of a man who does not know that a hundred German or any other civilizations ought to be "extirpated" if they can only live by the diabolical exhibition of militarism presented by this war, in which millions of our brothers are being mangled and killed amid shrieks, groanings and agonies that cannot be uttered, leaving behind them aged parents going down in sorrow to the grave, heart-broken widows who refuse to be comforted, and innocent little chil-

"Made in Germany"

dren thrust unprotected by a father's love upon a cold, cruel world. May God in infinite mercy save mankind from any civilization based on such diabolism!

MILITARISM AND THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT LARGE

We are constantly assured on the one hand, that this is not a war of the German people, who are amiable and peace-loving, but of the Kaiser and the military oligarchy that control the state. On the other hand, the Kaiser and all German writers declare that all classes of the people are absolutely one in regard to the war; they never cease to reiterate this as a fact to show the strength and justice of their cause. "Americans are mistaken," says the privy councilor, Professor Niessen, "in supposing that the common people in Germany are not in favor of militarism."

The German system of government explains this conflict of opinion. It consists of a hierarchy of officials beginning with the smallest town officer, each official being responsible to the next higher, until it reaches the chancellor, who is appointed and dismissed by the Kaiser, who is thus absolute. "Suffrage is on the three class system, which gives to the rich first class fifty to one hundred times the voting power that is possessed by the poor third class."

The German Congress consists of two bodies; the upper house called the Bundesrat which is appointed by the states and never debates but

German Militarism

merely votes, and the lower house, the Reichstag. Only by courtesy can the Reichstag be called a representative body since it has no final power. For example, let its members refuse to pass a supply bill or veto what the Kaiser wants and the order comes, "Break ranks, march!" and home they go.

The whole political and social machinery is as systematized and arbitrary as the movements of an army, and the common people have about as little voice as does the common soldier in directing their own movements. Thus the state is everything and the individual nothing. He is trained from infancy to blind, unquestioning obedience. He has complete liberty, however, within the walls of his large cell, or within the lines of the military guards that surround his industrial and all other social camps.

The German people are thus a part of the military machine. In a military atmosphere they live, move and have their being. Bismarck said that the German army was an "army of the folk itself." It is "theirs not to reason why," but to obey. In the words of the Kaiser, "Absolute, iron, blind obedience," is required and enforced.

If we add to this condition of servility and aloofness from the state, the profound ignorance of the common people, not in matters pertaining to their work, in which they are very intelligent, but in matters pertaining to the government, its internal affairs and its foreign

"Made in Germany"

policies, we have a partial explanation at least of what Professor Niessen calls the militarism of the common people. We do not believe, however, that the common people of Germany or any other civilized country, under normal conditions favor militarism. They hate it.

The German people have been fearfully and wonderfully duped into the belief that their country was being attacked and they were acting on the defensive. They were told that millions of enemies with flaming swords were on their frontiers hastening to lay the fatherland in ruins.

A manifesto signed by ninety-three German scholars, scientists and publicists says, "Germany did their utmost to prevent war"; again, "The struggle has been forced upon her," and the astounding statement, "A numerical superiority, which had been lying in wait on the frontiers assailed us." We once heard a clergyman gravely argue "that there were four kinds of lies," but the above fabrications would easily include all varieties. There is not a syllable of truth in these statements, but the people believed them and so doubtless did the authors themselves. Nobody had shown the least intention of "lying in wait." Nobody had "assailed" her or violated a single German right or proposed to do so. No hostile threat of any kind, by anybody, had been made, nor was there the least sign of such a thing on the whole political horizon; moreover and con-

German Militarism

clusively, this manifesto does not and cannot specify a single act in support of this astounding statement.

The people were told that the Kaiser, in his struggle for peace had, as it were, spent his nights in agonizing prayer and his days in pleading with the nations for a peace conference to prevent war. This great lie was swallowed whole by the people. All the world now knows that the exact opposite was the truth. The Allies were pleading with the Kaiser to stay the hand of Austria and so keep the peace. The Kaiser turned a deaf ear to all these entreaties. Germany was the aggressor. No German apologist dares to assert that the Kaiser could not by a single word have averted war, nor dare any deny that the Kaiser refused to speak that word.

So completely deceived are the people that at a public meeting held several months after hostilities began, it was resolved that the war must be continued until we "*leave our enemies incapable of ever again declaring war on Germany. Above all the continuous and most far reaching military preparedness is absolutely essential.*" Thus are the common people buncoed into forging the chains which bind them to a system of militarism imposed upon them by autocracy.

The ignorance of the common people was well illustrated at the battle of Liége. Dr. Frederick Lynch says in his "Through Europe on the

"Made in Germany"

Eve of War," "Those 25,000 poor German soldiers who were killed or wounded in that awful battle thought they were fighting Frenchmen who were trying to get into Germany. As a matter of fact the French had made no move up to this time and were still trying to secure peace."

How is it possible to keep people so intelligent as the Germans in ignorance on matters of such moment? The answer is, by a rigid censorship of the press and all other avenues of information. Opposition to the government is not tolerated. "Woe to the disobedient!" says the Kaiser. Newspapers are suppressed; freedom of speech curtailed; university professors are muzzled as we have seen; public opinion is manufactured, owned and controlled by the government with characteristic thoroughness and efficiency. Bismarck says, "It is the duty of the state to control public opinion. It has the means to accomplish this. The people must be made to believe whatever their rulers think it wise and best for them to believe."

It is this organized and efficient ignorance, this popular gullibility of the Germans fostered from childhood, and scientifically administered under the great seal of the state, that enables the government, under the shibboleth of love for the fatherland, to fool the people into the belief that they are fighting in self-defence. Sixty-five million Germans fell upon peaceful little Belgium and by plundering, burning and

German Militarism

murdering laid it in utter ruin, and when you ask a German the meaning of this, he replies, "Why, Germany is defending herself against Belgium!"

About two years ago Germany increased her army by 600,000 men. Soon afterwards France, in order to meet the danger, increased her army. The German people groaning under the load of armaments murmured against the additional burden. Listen now to the answer attributed to Bernhardt. "*The idea that our armaments are a reply to the armaments and policy of the French must be instilled into the people.*"

Was the ruse successful? Let the popular enthusiasm for the war, which German writers call militarism, answer. Even educated Germans believe that this great increase of the army was caused by and followed the increase of the French army, the exact reverse of the truth.

Another instance of deceiving the people appears in "The Truth About Germany." This says, "We have been forced to become a nation of soldiers in order to be free." No evidence is offered in support of the statement. The truth is the people have become soldiers to enable the Kaiser and military caste to enter upon aggressive wars of conquest. Germany in fear of losing her freedom! We cannot repress a smile. The Kaiser himself exclaims "We Germans fear God and nothing else in the world." "In this war it is Germany that strikes," says

Bismarck

"Made in Germany"

Harden, the able German journalist, and "When she has conquered new domains for her genius then the priesthood of all gods will praise the God of War." Not for defence nor from fear but for "*domains*" have Germans been forced to become soldiers. "Weak nations have no right to live," says another writer. Another authority writes, "we must not wait for some act of aggression but are justified in deliberately provoking a war." This is exactly what Germany has done. We could fill pages with similar quotations showing the purpose of Germany to wage war for dominion, and to impose her will and her culture upon other nations at the mouth of Krupps and the point of the bayonet. Could the common people of Germany be disillusioned this war would cease in thirty days. Some day they will know the truth for, as Lincoln said, you can fool some of the people all the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

MILITARISM IN THE GERMAN CHURCH

An eminent American divine has defined militarism as a system based on faith in military power and considerations as supreme over other power and considerations. If this is correct should we not all approve of militarism in a defensive war? Surely there is nothing necessarily wrong in such faith. Americans had it and had to have it in the wars that estab-

German Militarism

lished and preserved the republic. On their armies depended their all. The ultimate faith however, was in a God of justice and judgment, of righteousness and love.

Behind this terrible war there is something other than "A system based on military power and considerations as supreme." There is a martial spirit that in the last analysis means the murderous disposition or the lust of blood. This is militarism. It is not a "system" although in giving it vent, in applying it, a system is required, just as electricity is not a system although in applying it, a system is required.

In former times this brutal lust could be gratified in many ways. Men were tortured, torn asunder by wild beasts, or cut in pieces and thrown to fishes for the amusement of the people. Since this is no longer permitted, the only method of gratifying this militarism is by aggressive war. This is war for the sake of war and its trophies of scalps, conquest, loot and power. The great jingoes of history, Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon regarded these things as the acme of glory and their praises are still sung by the bestial instincts of man.

Jesus Christ is called the Prince of Peace. He it was who said, "Blessed are the peace makers for they shall be called the children of God." The world has a right to expect from his ministers loyalty to the great Teacher.

The attitude of religious leaders in Germany

"Made in Germany"

toward the war has surprised Christians the world over. In a letter "To the Evangelical Christians Abroad" they utterly ignore all efforts for a peaceful solution of the issue between Austria and Servia. They have no word of approval for Servia's proposal of arbitration, but refer to Austria's brutal ultimatum as "The justifiable vengeance for an abominable royal murder." Could it be true that the ministers of the Prince of Peace would thus reject the humble request for a peace conference to adjust differences? It was even so.

Let us take another instance of the relapse from Christianity. "The Truth About Germany" is signed by such theologians as Har-nack and such preachers as Dryander. They unblushingly assert that "*England and France were resolved not to respect the neutrality of Belgium.*" There is not a shred of evidence to support this statement. It is wholly false. In spite of her solemn agreement to keep out of Belgium, Germany had for twenty years been training her Krupps and strategic railroads upon Belgium. At length the little country became so alarmed that she consulted with England and France, also guarantors of her neutrality, as to what they should do in case Germany, regardless of her promise, should invade Belgium. That was all. Now these ministers declare that these very consultations, designed solely to have all parties respect Belgium neutrality, prove that "*England and France were*

German Militarism

resolved not to respect it!" The charge is false on the face of the facts. Borne along on the current of militarism these ministers are guilty of bearing false witness.

Let us turn now to the head of the Church, the Kaiser. His constant coupling of God and the army as preservers of the Empire is an evil omen. His declarations often end with, "So help me God and our German Sword." He believes himself to be a deeply religious man. Is his religion that of a Christian? Let us look for a moment at his conception of the Church. He says, "I am the *Summus Episcopus* of my Church," then he exclaims, "Hurrah for the dry powder and the sharp Sword!" Again he says, "The sole support and only protection of the Church are to be found in the Imperial hand and under the aegis of the German Empire." He said to his troops: "You think each day of your Emperor. Do not forget God." This reminds us of another occasion when he is reported to have bestowed the iron cross upon several officers and God received honorable mention. This "imperial hand" says, "When you encounter the enemy you will defeat him. No quarter shall be given, no prisoners taken."

These and many like utterances are by the Supreme Head of the Church in Germany. They are the negation of Christianity and reveal the paganism and militarism of the Church.

"Made in Germany"

When leading Germans say, "We are bound to follow our Kaiser," his religion is of the utmost importance. Of his dead ancestors he says, "*One day I shall have to render to them an account of both the honor and glory of my army.*" His *post mortem* "account" respecting a certain "scrap of paper," the invasion of Belgium, the burning of homes, shooting and starving the people, the dropping of bombs upon the houses of working men, the bombardment of undefended towns and killing women and babies, will doubtless be greeted with applause by spirits in a certain locality; but our point now is that *the public avowal of this worship of ancestors is distinctively pagan.*

Thor and Odin were ancient gods of the Germans. They delighted in war. They glorified good men, but the only good men were "warriors who died fighting." Listen now to the Kaiser. "*I do not know of any more reputable place to die in than in the midst of enemies.*" Thus the Kaiser pays homage to Thor.

Attila was a German butcher of men in war. He also murdered his own brother. He was known as the "Scourge of God." This is the man held up by the Kaiser as an example to his soldiers, as follows: "Just as the Huns a thousand years ago under the leadership of Attila gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live . . . so may the name of Germany become known in such manner in China

German Militarism

that no Chinaman will ever dare look askance at a German."

Attila claimed to be divine. The Kaiser also says, "Upon me the spirit of God has descended" and he is addressed as "Your Majesty's Sacred Person."

Attila was presented with the "Iron sword of the War-God." The Kaiser also bestows an iron token upon his braves.

Attila worshipped at the shrine of Odin who delighted in war and was armed with a thunder-bolt and hammer. The Kaiser kneels at the same shrine and pours into the listening ear of Odin these words constantly falling from his lips;—war, army, military service, soldiers, battle, fight, swords, troops, bravery, military honor, uniform, obedience, discipline, conquer, enemy, training, triumphs, conflict, shield, battle-field, brave deeds, blood, officers, regiments, guards, bayonets, cannon, navy, warships. No monarch ever lived possessed of such a war vocabulary or made such constant use of it.

This paganism is veiled with a veneering of Christianity. The Kaiser, however, is not a hypocrite. If he deceives others he is himself deceived. Just as the pious thug strangled his victim or the worshipper of Devi plunged his dagger into the heart of the unsuspecting, the act being preceded with prayer and followed by special religious rites, so the Kaiser, in soaking the soil of Europe with the blood of millions, considers himself engaged in a holy

"Made in Germany"

and honorable calling. He talks glibly of God, of the Bible, of Christ and of prayer. His religious terminology is Christian, but his god is Mars, his saviour is his Army, his holy spirit is the Sword, his heaven is Victory, his hell is Defeat, and his prayer is "Let the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the War Lord and of the House of Hohenzollern and let them reign forever and ever."

We are not, however, dealing with the religion of the Kaiser with reference to himself, but only as it shows the militarism of the Church of which he declares himself to be "*Summus Episcopus*." He is the representative. A stream will rise no higher than the fountain.

We have many declarations by leading men of his church that militarism is a good thing, the corner stone of the state, a divine institution to be zealously maintained in the future whatever be the issue of the present war.

Our position is that a civilization based upon this principle is anti-christian and barbarous. There is but one ethical standard of right and wrong. It applies to individuals and nations alike. It is futile, therefore, to say that by militarism Germans understand one thing, Americans another. It is not what anybody understands by it, but what the thing really is that counts. It means the abrogation of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." It means this *semper et ubique* and it never has

German Militarism

meant and it never will mean anything else.

However militarism may be disguised by the so called manly virtues, however masked by patriotism or cloaked by specious appeals for national expansion, aggrandizement and glory, it is pure thuggism in its essence, spirit and purpose, and an advancing civilization and the stars in their courses will fight against it until it is sent to the bottomless pit whence it came.

Our country, like every other, has its conscienceless jingoes. They are not, however, those who, while deploring war, favor reasonable armaments solely for defence. So long as a predatory nation is allowed to attack and reduce to vassalage another nation, so long will it be the only safe and sane policy for every nation to provide armaments for defence. This is not militarism, it is self-preservation.

"Germany in the Next War," page eleven says, "*The Germans must, regardless of the rights and interests of other peoples, fight their way to predominance and force upon humanity German culture and spirit.*"

Here is militarism in all its hideous, moral nakedness. Here is the iniquitous cause of the war stated concisely, adequately and truthfully.

The American people look with abhorrence upon such principles. They believe them to be subversive of religion and morals, of liberty and law, of truth and justice and all else that makes life worth living. Their views toward militarism and war, and toward peace and

"Made in Germany"

brotherhood among men, agree more and more with those of Washington beautifully expressed as follows: "My first wish is to see the whole world in peace and its inhabitants one band of brothers, striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind. As a citizen of the great republic of humanity, I indulge the idea that the period is not remote when the benefits of free commerce will succeed the devastation and horrors of war."

CHAPTER IV

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY

NEUTRALITY DEFINED

In the present war America is neutral, Americans are not neutral. This paradox is easily explained. In the first instance the word neutral is used in an international sense; in the second instance it is used in a moral sense. Internationally the United States is out of the war; morally its people are in it and in it just to the extent that they have moral convictions.

International neutrality was unknown to the ancients. Every nation was regarded as a friend or foe. The right of neutrality is a product of Christian civilization.

A proclamation of neutrality means that the nation issuing it will refrain from taking any part directly or indirectly in a war between other nations. "The impartiality which it is the duty of the neutral to observe towards the belligerents has been summed up by Vattel in two propositions cited by Wheaton with approval:—

"(1) That no assistance should be given to either party in matters relating to war, unless under some pre-existing stipulation;

"Made in Germany"

"(2) That in matters not relating to war, the neutral should not refuse to one belligerent merely because he is at war with the other, what she grants to that other."

The "impartiality" and "assistance" have reference to material things only and not to the feelings or sympathies of neutrals. The neutral nation, however, is to be regarded as the friend of all the belligerents.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S PROCLAMATION OF NEUTRALITY

Our President in his proclamation of neutrality warns the people against hasty and partisan speech. Men of all nations are among us as neighbors. War stirs the deepest emotions. Thus far we agree with him. We are, however, moral beings and freedom of speech and of the press are corner stones of this republic. There are vast moral and political issues involved in this war, and Americans have a legitimate and profound interest in them.

We cannot, therefore, agree with the President in urging a complete neutrality of thought. We are bound to treat all belligerents alike but we are not bound to *think* of them alike. Neutrality does not mean that the government or the people shall have no opinions about the war or refrain from expressing them. It does not mean that they may not consider its causes and consequences, or that they are indifferent to the issues involved, or the manner in which

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

the war is carried on. It does not hinder the people from criticising the belligerents. It requires neutral nations to assert and protect their own rights when threatened by belligerents, and, in case international laws governing the conduct of war are violated by any belligerent, it is the duty of a neutral, as one of the makers of such laws, to enter a solemn protest.

A subtle and mischievous thing about the discussion of neutrality in our country is the tacit assumption that there are two standards of morality concerning it, one for the private citizen and another for the government. Some say that private citizens may express their opinions, but the government must not criticise or protest against the most outrageous violations of international law by belligerents. Others regard the silence of the government in such cases as cowardly if not criminal.

A double standard of morality is essentially the negation of morality.

International or official neutrality is not above the requirements of the moral law. The maxim, nothing is politically right that is morally wrong is fundamental. Moral neutrality is a misnomer. God is not neutral. A moral being can no more be morally neutral than a seeing being can be without sight. Professor George Trumbull Ladd of Yale says, "Kant teaches us that there can be no such thing as moral neutrality." May we not add that the moral instincts of any child of ten years of age

"Made in Germany"

that has been properly brought up will give the same testimony.

THE CASE OF BELGIUM

We have called attention in a former chapter to Belgian neutrality which was guaranteed by France, England, Austria, Russia and Germany.

In the London convention of 1831 these five powers declared Belgium's neutrality and "*Guaranteed her that perpetual neutrality as well as the integrity and inviolability of her territory.*" The London treaty of 1839 made a similar declaration and added that, "*Belgium shall be bound to observe the same neutrality toward all other nations.*" In other words, Belgium agreed not to make war upon other nations, and these five signatory nations agreed not to permit war to be made on Belgium; that is, they guaranteed her neutrality. This meant that each guarantor was bound to go to war against any invader of Belgium, otherwise the guarantee is the veriest farce.

The position, therefore, that a guarantor of Belgian neutrality may fulfill the pledge to respect her neutrality, but need not protect it, is indefensible and dishonorable. To protect means if necessary to resort to force; but so does the protection of all agreements. The simplest contracts between individuals will be enforced by the sheriff and all the military forces of the state.

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

It cannot be denied that Germany was under the most solemn treaty obligations to keep out of Belgium, and that England, France and Russia were under similar obligations to draw the sword against her the moment she invaded Belgian territory.

It should be stated here that wholly apart from this treaty, Belgium, like every other country at peace, was immune by international law from invasion.

The Hague convention of 1907 only set its own seal to this well established law as follows: "*The territory of neutral nations is inviolable.*" "*Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or convoys whether munitions of war or supplies across the territory of a neutral power.*"

If for want of ratification or any other reason this provision does not apply, it should be remembered that the principle was in full force under international law, and this Hague declaration adds its cumulative force and great moral weight to the existing law, and places all parties under supreme obligations to observe it. So absolutely indisputable is this obligation that the German Chancellor, Herr von Bethmann Hollweg used these words in the Reichstag: "Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and are perhaps even now on Belgian soil. This act is contrary to the rights of nations." He proceeded to justify it on the grounds of military necessity. The doctrine of military

"Made in Germany"

necessity is recognized by law. It is defined as, "*The necessity which in war attends military operations and is held sufficient to justify the damaging or destruction of rights conceded to exist in time of peace. It does not admit of cruelty, wanton destruction or perfidy.*" It does not admit of the violation of a promise or trust or of "*modern law and usages of war.*"

No military necessity, therefore, existed for the invasion of Belgium, as indeed the German Chancellor well knew. His only ground for such act, had he declared it, was the vicious principle that might makes right.

The moral obtuseness of his declaration, its political lawlessness and insolent audacity are without parallel. Its consequences have struck terror and indignation into the hearts of men everywhere. The crime of Germany against Belgium was fourfold. *It was a violation of international law; of her solemn pledge of guarantee; of her written renewal by Bismarck in 1870, and of the Hague convention of 1907.* Whatever be the issue of the war, the unanimous verdict of the world will be the complete condemnation of Germany and the complete justification of Belgium.

Furthermore, it will be seen that the law of military necessity as above defined does not admit of "*cruelty, wanton destruction or perfidy.*" These are the very things of which Germany has been guilty in invading Belgium, killing its citizens, and in her submarine bar-

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

barities. England, on the other hand, to her praise be it said, in her measures of retaliation and reprisal has scrupulously conformed to this law, and the law may be held to be sufficiently elastic to justify her course respecting the commerce of neutral nations.

BENEVOLENT NEUTRALITY

This is a kind of "imperfect" neutrality or a friendly leaning to one side.

By way of preface let us say that at the outset of the war Americans were singularly free from prejudice. We loved England, we admired Germany, we esteemed France and were hoping the best for Russia. Our opinions have not been governed by *ex parte* statements, racial sympathy, political affinities, religious beliefs or commercial interests, but solely by the everlasting right and wrong involved in the war, in the way it was begun and has been carried on. Never was a jury impaneled more impartial, more intelligent, more anxious to hear all the evidence, or more conscientious in weighing it, than have been the people of the United States in this war.

This war took the world by surprise. The sudden invasion of Belgium and the awful slaughter at Liège where 25,000 Germans were killed or wounded, paralyzed this country where the peace movement had become deeply rooted in the hearts of the people. Then came the President's proclamation of neutrality which

"Made in Germany"

was greeted with enthusiasm. The average citizen did not know just what neutrality was or required but he took the President's word for it. Let us look at our neutrality with reference to Belgium by making use of a parable.

A, B, and G jointly establish a law that neither shall trespass upon the premises of the other. After a while G, in defiance of the law, invades B's premises and a fight ensues for possession. What now is the duty of A? Has A no interest or obligation in upholding the law to which he is a party? Can he legally or morally proclaim neutrality? But one answer is possible. A normal child of ten years with unerring instinct and absolute truth would say that A was bound to go to the assistance of B. In no other way could the law by which all parties were bound be upheld. Furthermore it is A's own law and no less so because it is also the law of B and C. A had no right to become a party to a law which he was not under obligations to help enforce. If A does not demand the benefits of the law for B, he cannot demand them for himself. If when G invaded B's premises, A had proclaimed neutrality, he would have violated the law, betrayed B and sanctioned anarchy.

A is America, B is Belgium and G is Germany. They had between them an international law which forbade either to trespass upon the territory of the other. Germany, in defiance of the law, trespassed upon Belgian

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

territory and war ensued. It was the duty of America to go to the assistance of Belgium. Let it be borne in mind that it was America's own law as well as the law of Belgium and Germany. *International law is now everywhere held to be the common law of the land.* If America does not demand the benefits of the law for Belgium she may not demand them for herself. America had no right to become a party to a law and then refuse to be a party to its enforcement. That would be the attitude of the Maine statesman toward prohibition; he was in favor of the law—but against its enforcement.

When Germany invaded Belgium the neutrality proclaimed by America would have violated law, betrayed Belgium and introduced international anarchy had it not been for a single circumstance, viz: a release from her obligations by Belgium.

Belgium had a legal, international and moral right to call upon every nation amenable to international law to help her enforce that law against Germany, who frankly and officially said to the world upon her invasion of Belgium, "*This act is contrary to the rights of nations.*"

As a party to international law, therefore, and upon its confessed violation, the United States had no more right to proclaim neutrality without the consent of Belgium, than she has to proclaim neutrality should one of our states de-

"Made in Germany"

declare war against another, or a foreign power declare war against the state of Massachusetts. Belgium, by implication, gave her consent. She did not call on the United States for help.

The President issued his proclamation of neutrality. It soon became evident that he had gone beyond the requirements of what jurists call "strict" neutrality, or the withholding material assistance from either side, and enjoined neutrality in speech, feeling and thought toward all acts of the belligerents, including the blackest and most colossal crime in human history—the invasion of Belgium. Here we have an instance of benevolent neutrality, a friendly leaning to one side. In what did this leaning consist? In the failure to make a solemn protest against Germany's violation of international law in the invasion of Belgium.

In releasing the United States from the obligation of physical support, Belgium did not and could not release us from the duty of protesting against the overthrow of our own common law and the law common to the nations by the act of Germany.

Our failure to make this protest, our acquiescence in this violation of international law and the terrible crime committed, gave Germany a moral advantage over Belgium of great importance. This we repeat is benevolent neutrality. In addition to this, it did violence to the right, dishonored the law, and misrepresented the people who, while they hate war and

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

rejoiced to escape it, regard the obligations of their country, the sovereignty of her laws, and her honor as paramount to all other considerations. It should be noted that all other neutral powers followed the example of the United States in consenting, by their silence, to this outrageous breach of the world's laws.

What was the effect of this benevolent neutrality toward Germany upon her methods of warfare? The political and military philosophy of Germany is absolutely unique in the world of to-day. It is summarized by her foremost men in the shibboleths, "*World power or Downfall*" and "*We are and must be barbarians.*"

Such utterances were at first regarded as the hysterical vaporings of the Kaiser and his arrogant brood of Junkers. They were taken more seriously, however, when we heard German philosophers, statesmen and scholars declaring that Gott had destined their country to become ruler of the world, that its duty was to "impose German civilization and kultur" upon all peoples through "The will to power," to be realized by means of "the German sword."

German apologists now assure us that these sentiments were unauthorized and do not represent their government. Even the Kaiser says, "A world power is pure nonsense."

What these sentiments do represent, however, is the exact procedures of the Germans in the conduct of the war. It is idle to say that a

"Made in Germany"

government repudiates a barbarous philosophy when it practices it so literally as to horrify the world.

Pan-Germanism is now asserting its world-power aspirations by confronting with her armies Great Britain, France, Russia and Serbia, by taking command of the armies of Austria-Hungary, by taking possession of Belgium and Luxemburg, by purchasing with gold the non-interference of Bulgaria, by equipping and officering the troops of Turkey, and by saying to Italy, if reports are true, "Serve my interests or share the fate of Belgium."

Imperial Rome never dreamed of such dominion and power. After eight months of war Germany is boldly proclaiming her steadfast purpose to conquer all her enemies and achieve the conquest of Europe if not the world.

As to her other shibboleth of barbarism she has been ruthlessly faithful. Her Chancellor put the whole idea and policy in a nut shell, when he declared in the Reichstag that "*Necessity knows no law.*" This means that each belligerent, deeming it a "necessity" to succeed may set aside all laws of civilized warfare. It declares that a man feeling it a "necessity" to possess the purse of another, will recognize no law against killing him and will proceed to do so.

This is the abrogation of all law and government. It is the reign of pandemonium. It is not so much the doctrine that might makes

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

right as that might makes hades. This is the principle, than which no man-eating Tierra del Fuegan, no scalping North American savage or murderous thug, ever conceived one more brutal and diabolical, which the Chancellor of Germany unblushingly proclaimed in the Reichstag would be followed in her methods of warfare.

In acquiescing in this principle at the outbreak of the war we believe the United States was guilty of benevolent neutrality toward Germany which has greatly encouraged the lawlessness of her course, while inflicting a most damaging blow upon Belgium and the allies, and making necessary great sacrifices on the part of the United States, and is now endangering our peace. Observe the outcome of this infamous doctrine that "necessity knows no law."

The Outlook of February 3, 1915, after citing the recognized rules of civilized warfare, says, "To allow the violations of that law to pass unnoticed is to be unfaithful to civilization. . . . That law was violated in the invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium, and it is charged that the law was violated in Chinese territory. It has been violated in the dropping of bombs by airmen upon civilians and upon private property, whether the towns in which such civilians were killed and such property destroyed were defended or not. It has been violated in the deliberate bombardment of un-

"Made in Germany"

defended towns and undefended districts in great cities. It has been violated by pillage, by the levying of illegal contributions upon at least one province and several cities, by the exaction of collective penalties for individual acts, by the demand for millions of dollars of merchandise from private parties. It has been violated in the needless bombardment and destruction of monuments of religion, education and art. It has been violated in the forcing of inhabitants of occupied territory to furnish information about the armies of their own nation. It has been violated in the laying of mines in the open sea. It has been violated in raids by sea and land, and by other measures whose only possible military consequence, and therefore whose evident object, was to strike terror into the hearts of non-combatants. . . . There has been exhibited time and time again a ruthless brutality that cannot be explained as the irresponsible action of individual soldiers, but involves the deliberate military policy of responsible officers.

"If there had never been a Hague convention signed, the moral interests of the United States in these infractions of the public law of nations would still be plain. The fact that there are Hague conventions and that the United States has signed and confirmed them makes all the more plain not only the interest of the United States in these infractions, but the right of the United States to say something

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

about them. In the face of these facts how can the United States remain silent?"

Benevolent neutrality whether active or passive toward any belligerent is equivalent to an unneutral act.

Upon the violation of international law, it is the unquestioned legal right and moral duty of every other country belonging to the family of nations, to enter its protest against such violation.

What may a belligerent do by way of reprisal against an adversary who has violated international law? Sir Edward Grey says, "*It is impossible for one belligerent to depart from rules and precedents and for the other to remain bound by them.*" Such is the rule and it has been applied in many instances. How far may the reprisal go in violation of law? There must be limits. Humanity requires them. This is a question not yet settled by international law. It is well settled, however, that in no case can a nation in making reprisals resort to "cruelty, wanton destruction or perfidy."

How far can such reprisals invade the rights of neutrals? This is the subject matter of notes exchanged between the United States and Great Britain and Germany. We have protested to Germany against the establishment of war zones and submarine attacks that might destroy American shipping and lives, and to Great Britain against the use of the

"Made in Germany"

American flag by her merchant vessels. Great Britain is within her rights in the occasional use of our flag and she disclaims any intention of its general use. Both countries, therefore, agree as to the law and its observance. Germany on the other hand persists in her illegal course in regard to mines and submarines.

Great Britain's violations of international law thus far appear to have been by way of reprisals against such violations by Germany. Germany has been in every instance the aggressor and, so far as Great Britain has replied in kind, she is justified by numerous precedents or by the law of military necessity.

Germany first mined the North Sea in violation of neutral rights if not of belligerent rights. She made no provision for the safety of neutral vessels. Thereupon Great Britain placed mines in the same waters, but what is all important, she made careful provision for the safety of neutral vessels. Germany first dropped bombs from Zeppelins upon undefended cities and towns and non-combatants. Then, if reports are true, the allies retaliated by dropping bombs upon Friburg and Muremburg. A German squadron of war vessels made a raid upon unfortified English coast towns killing many civilians including women and children. It was only after the German government took possession of food stuffs that Great Britain declared them contraband, which she had a perfect right to do. Germany, how-

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

ever, declared this attempt to starve her people violated the rules of war and justified her own counter violation by piratical submarines. She admits that food for her army is contraband, but non-contraband for civilians. *There are no civilians in Germany.* She has repeatedly declared that the people and army are one. Bismarck said, "The German army is an army of the folk itself. It represents the whole German people." Twenty-two German universities unite in the following declaration to foreign universities: "Our army comprises the whole nation from the first to the last man." Thus every man is a soldier and every woman a daughter of a regiment. How then can Germany pretend that food for the people is not food for the army and consequently that all importations of food are not properly contraband? Her logic is further embarrassed by the fact that she has confiscated the food throughout the country. Her promise that all imported food shall go to non-combatants only, cannot be taken seriously since she has officially declared that "Necessity knows no law" which includes the law of veracity.

In general it may be said that Great Britain has sought to carry on war in accordance with international law, while Germany has trampled upon that law at every step. Already twenty-five neutral vessels have been destroyed by submarine mines indiscriminately laid by Germany, while up to the present time not a

"Made in Germany"

single neutral vessel has suffered from mines laid by England.

In spite of these facts one constantly hears such statements as "It will not do for us to condemn either side exclusively"; "Both sides are equally guilty." So far as silence can speak, the United States has said this, thereby doing great injustice to the Allies and giving great encouragement to Germany. This is benevolent neutrality.

The course pursued by the United States in the case of the Belgian Mission is another instance of benevolent neutrality by our government.

Not only treaty obligations but international law prohibited Germany from entering Belgium. Her presence there was therefore a trespass.

All hostilities were illegal; all killing of Belgians was murder; all burning of buildings was arson; all seizing of property was pillage; all levies of money, taking of hostages and other acts were the acts of brigands. That these things were done by an army in no way alters the character of their acts. In resisting them the Belgians, according to the Hague conventions, committed no act of war, but lawfully defended their property, their homes and their lives.

All this is a matter of supreme concern to all neutral countries, not only because of humane considerations, but especially because of

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

the violation of international law which is their own law and as sacred as their municipal law.

Acting upon this just assumption, the Belgian government in September last sent a Mission, consisting of her Minister of Justice and three Ministers of State, to the United States to lay before the President, "An account of the violation of the neutrality of Belgium and of the laws of war on Belgian territory."

The President received the Mission. It laid before him the violation of Belgian neutrality and the atrocities committed by the German army. Among these were the killing of citizens, the massacre of Aerschot and the whole revolting story of burning, killing, extortion, seizing hostages and the use of women as screens against bullets. Names, places, dates and all details for verification were given. All these acts were not only violations of the laws of war but barbarous.

The President listened to the story and must have been profoundly moved. He told the Mission that, while as a neutral he could not conduct an *ex parte* investigation, he would favor an international investigation at the end of the war.

So far, the course of the President was wise and statesmanlike, but he left undone the thing he should have done. He should have protested not to Germany alone, but in a note to all the belligerents and to all nations against all vio-

"Made in Germany"

lations of the laws of war. Such protest was due from this great nation. It was not only perfectly consistent with the strictest neutrality, but neutrality itself demanded it. All considerations of public morality and law demanded it. No offence could possibly have been taken by any belligerent from such a protest courteously and impartially worded. Other neutrals would have followed our example and, as intimated by Sir Edward Grey, such protest would undoubtedly have led to a diminution of the horrors of the war.

The President knew that at least a part of the indictment, the illegal invasion of Belgium, was true. He had copies of the posted orders of German officers to shoot hostages and other innocent civilians. These inhuman orders alone called upon the President to protest. The agonizing cries of thousands of wounded and dying men innocent of wrong called upon him to protest. Outraged international law in thunder tones called upon him to protest. Every nation in the world should have protested. Every community, every church, every brotherhood, every man and woman on the face of the earth might well have protested. Universal justice and mercy pleaded with the President to protest. The brave but bleeding Belgians, being crucified for their devotion to the sovereignty of law and the sanctity of treaties, called upon him to protest. Such protest was due the King of Belgium and his highest dig-

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

nitaries who had crossed the ocean to obtain it. It was due the humane people of the United States and all other countries, who were paralyzed at this relapse from civilized warfare into the blood-curdling cruelties of savages.

We are told that these charges are made by enemies and are not true. Let us see. We have before us the fac-simile copies of twelve proclamations and scores of orders issued by German commanders, posted in public places, dated, signed and certified. Any one can verify them. No one denies them. They teem with such phrases as "Shoot on the spot." "The whole place will be burned down." "The town will be razed in a quarter of an hour." "It was with my consent that the general had the whole place burned down and about one hundred people shot." (The actual number was four hundred.) "Hostages have been taken and on the first attempt to destroy the telegraph, they will be immediately shot." "The town of Wavre will hand over \$600,000 or be set on fire," and so on *ad infinitum et ad nauseum*. α

In the face of facts so open that he who runs may read, twenty-two German universities have united in sending a formal protest to foreign universities, denying these accusations against German troops, and we are bound to believe they are sincere. It should be borne in mind, however, that German universities

"Made in Germany"

are under government control and must think, speak and act largely as government directs.

The charges by Germans that the allies were using dum dum bullets were entitled to the same consideration as those made by the Belgian Mission. It was not enough for the President simply to receive the charges and dismiss the complainants. Something more was due the representatives of a nation that waited upon the President and formally presented grave charges that weapons known only to savage warfare were being used. The President should have expressed his full sympathy with the views of the protestants and, though declining an *ex parte* investigation, or to pronounce judgment in the matter, he should have sent a solemn protest to all belligerents, against the use of dum dum bullets as a violation of the international laws of war, to which the United States was a party and under the most solemn obligations to uphold. His failure to do this was a distinct favor to the Allies and a distinct injury to Germany, an instance of benevolent neutrality having all the force of an unneutral act. It was none the less so because of its smaller significance in comparison with the charges of the Belgian Mission.

Our President and all others who object that our protest against violation of the laws of war would have been offensive to Germany

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

seem to forget that Germany herself officially appeared before the President and requested him to make such protest.

It has been objected that this view of the duty of the United States would have required us to be continually protesting against every alleged violation of the laws of war. Why not? This is exactly what the United States is doing in her own territory. Every day she is making complaints, that is, protesting against the violation of her laws and doing all she can to put a stop to it. No one criticises such acts as meddlesome or undignified. Why then should she be silent under the specious plea of neutrality, when her larger and more sacred law, because common to all nations, is trampled upon? That such silence helps the law breaker and injures the sufferer will not be denied. This is benevolent neutrality and a violation of all law common, international and moral.

It may be objected that this view would require us to support our protest with force which would mean war. It certainly would, unless we were honorably released from such obligation by agreement, distance, unpreparedness or other circumstance. If the United States belongs to the family of nations we cannot escape its obligations. Can we claim its benefits and decline its burdens? Can we demand the protection of international laws and then refuse to help support them? The

"Made in Germany"

President answers in the affirmative. We answer in the negative.

The obligation to take up arms for the enforcement of international law is precisely what is contemplated by collective action to establish an international court with a police force, which would be an army, to prevent any nation from making war.

Another objection against protests is that they might "involve us in serious complications." The objectors wisely refrain from making any suggestions as to how this might happen. It is a gratuitous assumption and a bogey. We have already made repeated protests far more objectionable, because relating exclusively to our own interests, but no "serious complications" have followed or are likely to follow. How much less likely then are such "serious complications," when our protests concern matters in which our sole interest is the integrity and sanctity of international law and the blessings that follow its observance?

Our distinguished ex-president, William H. Taft, endorses President Wilson's course and says, he "would not have interfered by diplomatic protest regarding the invasion of Belgium." Is a protest interference? To interfere is to meddle in matters that do not concern us. Did not the violation of international law in the invasion of Belgium concern us? Are we not a member of the family of nations so that international law is our law as well? If

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

so are we "interfering" when we ask that the law be observed? We should constantly bear in mind the fact that all jurists hold that international law is the common law of the land. It was our legal duty, therefore, to protest against its violation in the invasion of Belgium.

There was another and infinitely more binding obligation to protest resting upon the United States, and that was the moral obligation imposed upon us by the behests of our Christian religion and the common conscience of mankind. This is the *Suprema Lex* towering above all human laws and treaties to which all men, all presidents and nations, all kings and potentates and peoples owe immediate and unconditional obedience. Any neutrality that defies this law is vicious and unneutral in its very nature.

It was and still is the mandate of this supreme law, that a solemn protest be made against the unrighteousness of the invasion of Belgium and the hordes of murderers, incendiaries and brigands who were turned loose upon her soil.

Closely akin to the foregoing objection that a protest would be "interference" is the one expressed as follows, "We should mind our own business."

This is precisely the position first taken by a gentleman by the name of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" What business is it of ours how the laws of nations are violated?

"Made in Germany"

What do we care how many Belgians are murdered in cold blood? "Mind our own business!" That is just what the chief priests said to Judas when he begged them to take back the thirty pieces of silver because he had betrayed innocent blood: "What is that to us? see thou to that;" "We mind our own business." That is what the priests and Levites said as they passed by on the other side, leaving the poor man who had been robbed and wounded to suffer and die by the side of the road. "Mind our own business" is the literal translation of the diplomatic language of the President to the envoys of Belgium and Germany when they laid before him the alleged violations of the laws not only of nations but of humanity.

Ex-President Taft says, "A neutral nation which fails to protest against violations of the laws of war as between belligerents, cannot be said to acquiesce in those violations or to recognize them in any way as a precedent which will embarrass us." This dictum seems faulty for several reasons.

(1) It ignores the fact that "the laws of war" are our own laws. This fact alone settles the matter.

(2) Mr. Taft, when president, was not silent when the laws were violated, but vigorously protested in the proper manner. Had he not done so he would have acquiesced in their violation.

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

(3) If a member of a family commits a series of crimes and the other members stand silently by making no protest, would Mr. Taft say "They could not be said to acquiesce in those violations of law"?

(4) This dictum is hostile to a maxim which universal experience has sanctioned, namely: "*Silence gives consent,*" *that is, failure to protest is acquiescence.*

(5) Mr. Taft says, "When the action of a belligerent directly affects our commercial interests, *then we must protest or acquiesce in the wrong.*" In one breath he says failure to protest *is not acquiescence* and in the next breath he says failure to protest *is acquiescence*. In matters of commerce we are bound to protest, but in matters of morals we have no concern!

(6) He says such protest would "Injure our attitude of neutrality." This assumes that we must be neutral toward the violation of international laws. Does our "attitude of neutrality" require us to keep still when international law is violated? Strict neutrality merely refuses material aid to either side. It does not require or imply neutrality or indifference toward the violation of the laws of war.

(7) The most serious objection to this position is its absolute divorce from morality. The matter is treated as if it were one of expediency merely. All questions of right and honor,

"Made in Germany"

of justice and humanity, and all reverence for international law are carefully eliminated. The wicked invasion of Belgium, the wholesale extortion, burning, pillage and murder have no claim to notice upon the United States! We are and must be neutral toward this iniquity; neutral toward the violation of the moral law of the universe; neutral toward the sufferings of our fellow men; neutral especially toward the cries of the wounded, the groans of the dying, the streaming tears of widowed wives, sonless mothers and the homeless, starving women and children of Belgium! Undoubtedly we should "abhor that which is evil," but let us keep still about it, since a protest would, in the words of Mr. Taft, "injure our attitude of neutrality!"

Opinions differ as to whether the Hague conventions are binding upon neutrals and belligerents. The last article says that unless all belligerents sign them they are null. Servia did not sign them. If all had signed it is conceded that these conventions would have created a treaty to which the United States was a signatory, and that we should have been bound to protest against its violation; as it is we are not so bound. This is Mr. Taft's position. Is it tenable? Suppose the Hague conventions, as such, are not legally binding, it is a *non sequitur* to infer that we should not protest against their violations. We are not legally bound to be grateful, but it does not

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

follow that we should not protest against ingratitude. What the Hague conventions condemned were moral wrongs. Moreover, pre-existing international law had already forbidden these things, so that they were illegal as well. Let us suppose a parallel case.

A convention resolves that theft be prohibited, but unless all the members sign the resolution it is not in force. Very soon a member begins to steal. Could any one object to a protest on the ground that all the members did not sign the resolution? If not why not? Because it is wrong to steal. Because two pre-existing laws, one moral and one criminal forbade it. The resolution was only declaratory although it emphasized the pre-existing laws.

Turn now to the Hague conventions. They prohibit the invasion of a neutral nation and killing her people, but unless all the belligerents sign the conventions they are not in force. Very soon Germany invaded Belgium and killed her people. Could any one object to a protest on the ground that all the members had not signed the conventions? If not why not? Because such invasion and killing are wrong. Because two pre-existing laws, one moral and one international forbade them. The conventions were only declaratory, although they emphasized the pre-existing laws.

If the conventions did not legally, *per se*, demand a protest, the two other laws did demand one. They are the laws of our own

"Made in Germany"

and all other nations. Moreover, the Hague conventions are morally binding, since they register the moral convictions and pledges of a large majority of the forty-three nations represented. Add to this the obligation of the other pre-existing moral and international laws, and the United States may well feel that the Hague conventions have all the dignity and force of positive laws, binding upon us, and against the violation of which we are bound to protest by every consideration of honor and justice.*

A prominent religious journal expresses the fear of some that a protest "would have carried this nation to the verge of war." In what would the offence consist? We have already made several protests and no offence has been taken. We protested against England's detention of our ships in the search for contraband. No one thought of war in the matter. Again we protested against the warships of belligerents hovering about our coasts just outside the three miles limits, and again against the general use of our flag by British merchantmen, and again against the prohibition of all commercial intercourse by sea with Germany other than by legal blockade. No war or sign of war

*I am indebted to the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt for the following suggestion received after this was in type: "You are quite right in saying that we should have interfered for Belgium even if the Hague Conventions had not demanded it. But, as a matter of fact, they did demand it. When on August 3rd, Germany invaded Belgian territory Germany was not at war with either Serbia or Montenegro. All the belligerents, so far as Germany was concerned, were signers of the Hague Convention; and there is no excuse for Germany's action and no excuse for our inaction. And we must not shrink from war *if war is necessary to righteousness.*" (The italics are ours.)

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

has followed these protests. We have also protested against Germany's unlawful submarine method of warfare and threatened, in case of the loss of American ships or lives, that we "should be constrained to hold the Imperial government of Germany to a strict accountability." Did this protest and threat bring us "to the verge of war"? Not at all. We do not want war.

A courteous protest to Germany against the invasion of Belgium, the killing of her citizens and other unlawful acts, could not be in any sense a *casus belli*. On the contrary there is every reason to believe that such protest would have appealed to the sentiments of justice, humanity and reverence for law that, in spite of German acts, must be struggling for expression in the German breast.

Such protest should be couched in the most courteous and friendly terms. It should state that, inasmuch as the United States was a member of the family of nations, owing allegiance to and bound by the rules and regulations for the conduct of war, as established by international law, she felt it to be her privilege and duty to call the attention of all belligerents and neutral nations to the requirements of these laws, and to the imperative necessity of upholding them. It should recite the alleged infractions of these laws without pronouncing judgment, or necessarily naming accused belligerents. It should then solemnly protest

"Made in Germany"

against these and all violations of international law, and warn all nations that they would be held responsible by the great family of nations for such violations. It should then urge all nations to utter a similar protest and warning.

We believe such a protest, especially if followed by other neutrals, would have made a profound impression and have mitigated the horrors of the war. Had it anticipated the invasion of Belgium, it might have prevented it. It is too late to prevent what has happened, but it is not too late to influence the future. It is never too late to do right. Whenever we refuse to do the right thing, we are helping the party that is doing wrong, and this is benevolent neutrality.

THE NEUTRALITY OF IGNORANCE

There is some excuse for the neutrality of ignorance on the part of those who, for lack of time or opportunity, are unable to learn the facts connected with the war, and so to form an intelligent judgment. Neutrality in such cases is the only honest position to take. Some, however, profess to be neutral on the ground that the truth which would justify them in taking sides is not now obtainable.

A writer fresh from the scenes of war, where he had spent several months, says, "Americans will be amazed to hear the truth about the war in Europe," and he adds that "the news we get is distorted by the English to suit their own

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

purposes." We looked eagerly through his address for facts or items of information, which of course he must have had to justify his sweeping assertion, but we looked in vain. He did not give even a hint of the things at which we should be "amazed," and the fair inference is that he could not. It was an instance of the fallacy of *argumentum ad ignorantiam* and amounted only to the stereotyped personal opinion of the German apologist posing as a neutral. a.

We do not believe that the end of the war will add to our knowledge of its origin, causes and conduct thus far. The means of knowledge in our day are too many and certain to leave us in any doubt concerning these things. All history bearing upon the war, all material facts leading up to it, all essential diplomatic correspondence preceding it, all the preparations, all the books, lectures and speeches that for years have been advocating it, and all the objects to be sought by it, are known to us in all fullness and completeness. The points that are in dispute are wholly immaterial. No future day or age will begin to have a knowledge of the war so clear, accurate and complete as we now possess. Minor details and incidents will appear, but lapse of time will obscure far more truth than it will bring to light.

Of course there are remote causes of this war; there are remote causes of everything. The chain of cause and effect runs back to

"Made in Germany"

Adam. Remote and indirect causes open the field of speculation where the human mind delights to roam. No just judgment, however, as to the responsibility for this war or any other is possible that is based on causes indirect, remote, historical, philosophical, political, military, racial, physical, psychological or moral running back through millenniums. A just judge and jury ask, "Who committed this crime?" The remote causes are properly excluded as irrelevant and the perpetrator is declared guilty and punished.

Over against this view there is an antiquated cast of mind like that of Professor Casaubon, very scholarly and wholly untrammelled by common sense, which assures us that near vision, owing to passion and prejudice, is subject to intellectual astigmatism and is unreliable, that distance alone furnishes that calm and dispassionate mood for investigation that yields assured results. As distance increases, the object becomes ever clearer, and not until it passes entirely out of sight do we have all the conditions for perfect vision. Only give us sufficient time and we shall discover where Homer was born, who wrote Shakespeare's plays, that no such character as Shakespeare ever lived, and the writings attributed to him were several hundred years earlier or later than the traditional date.

More seriously, we assert that there is a class of minds that finds satisfaction in ignorance,

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

in case of controversy or conflict between their fellow men. In this war they do not know or care to know the merits of either side, since such knowledge would disturb their neutrality of ignorance. "Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise." The neutral attitude of thousands can be accounted for only on this ground. They cannot say who brought on the war, or what was the cause, or what is the object of it.

By neutrality of ignorance, we would not imply that such neutrals are necessarily ignorant men; on the contrary they are often men of ability and learning who have, however, shut their eyes to the truth about this war. They tell us that many causes political, military, commercial and racial, etc., contributed to produce it; that it was a development from "historical roots;" that it was a necessity in the evolution of the race; that, in the nature of things, it was bound to come anyway. They assign almost every reason for the war except the truth which they would not relish and for that reason do not and cannot perceive.

Another variety of the neutrality of ignorance is thus stated by President Arthur T. Hadley of Yale University: "*To any one who looks at the present European crisis dispassionately, the striking thing—I may well say the pathetic thing—is the failure of the different nations to understand anything about one another's point of view.*"

"Made in Germany"

President Hadley's views carry weight with all thinking men, and the article from which this sentence is taken is excellent and timely. It seems to us, however, that in this quotation the exact reverse of what is stated is true. Instead of "The failure of the different nations to understand anything about one another's point of view," it was because they did understand "one another's point of view" so perfectly, that a peaceful solution was impossible. If this is true no one can plead the ignorance of the belligerents as a reason for being neutral. It is just this fact, viz.: that the opposing "points of view" were so clearly understood, that caused the war, and explains the intensity, bitterness and determination with which it is carried on. Never was an issue joined better understood by the contestants, or more concisely stated, or more scientifically planned and pursued by at least one of the belligerents.

For the first time in the history of the world, almost the entire body of diplomatic correspondence preceding the war is by each belligerent officially published to the world. In this correspondence "one another's point of view" is made perfectly clear. If any attempt was made to darken counsel it was promptly exposed by an opponent.

It is true the common people in Germany did not understand the situation. They were told and believed that hostile armies had reached their borders and were about to destroy their

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

country, and in obedience to orders they flew to arms to repel the imaginary invaders. The Kaiser, however, and his whole militaristic brood of advisers knew better. Add to this the war propaganda carried on for a generation by the government, by the military clique headed by 35,000 army officers, by the universities in which militarism is a part of the curriculum and by the schools in which the children are taught that the chief end of man is to glorify war and enjoy it forever.

Let us contrast some of these conflicting "points of view" and see if they are hard to be understood.

Germany, through her representatives, has for many years been declaring that "War is a good thing"; England on the other hand declares that "War is hell." Is there anything obscure about these "points of view"? Germany declares that "Might makes right"; England replies that "Right makes might." Germany declares that "Small nations have no right to live"; England replies that "Small nations have the same right to live as large nations." Germany says a treaty is only a "scrap of paper"; England says, "A treaty is a solemn pledge that must be kept." Germany says, "Necessity knows no law"; England replies, "Necessity cannot violate the laws of justice and humanity." Germany says, "We will fulfill our destiny which is to rule the world"; and again the Kaiser says, "In

"Made in Germany"

the German dwells that conquering power which will open the world to him"; England replies, "You shall not conquer or rule the British Empire."

We could fill page after page with similar contrasting declarations. They were uttered, not in the midst of "blind rage and passion," but in a time of profound peace. Do they present a "point of view" difficult to understand? On the contrary, in every one of these contrasts, the "point of view" is clear and distinct, and it is because the belligerents do understand them and perceive that they are so absolutely opposite and irreconcilable, that the survival of one means the death of the other, that they have referred them to the arbitrament of the sword.

Substantially the same contrasts exist between the "point of view" of Russia, France and Servia, on the one hand and those of Germany on the other. Austria's "point of view" was to reduce Servia to a state of vassalage; Servia's "point of view" was to maintain her independence. Never were "points of view" more distinctly stated or better understood by all parties.

If Americans find it difficult to believe that the above are authentic quotations from leading German officials and writers, let them consider how exactly the illegal acts and revolting cruelties practiced by the Germans in this war tally with the barbarous and brutal principles

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

avowed in these contrasted declarations. President Hadley well said, "The outward acts of violence are but the symptoms of the nation's mental state."

If it appears that the "mental state" of each belligerent nation was thoroughly understood by the others, then there is no ground for an attitude of neutrality based on the assumption that the belligerents were ignorant of "one another's point of view."

SYMPATHETIC NEUTRALITY

In international law neutrality is refraining from giving material aid to either of the opposing belligerents. It has nothing whatever to do with the *opinions* of the neutral. In other words, legal neutrality does not extend to the feelings, thought or speech of the neutral nation. It is, therefore, an error to say that the United States should observe the spirit as well as the law of neutrality.

The *law* of neutrality is one of those *mala prohibita* which imply, *per se*, no moral obligation, while the *spirit* of neutrality goes behind the law and deals with its moral aspects and is a matter of conscience. We have already seen that there is no such thing as moral neutrality.

Our neutrality should be honest and strictly enforced and in these respects the course of President Wilson is to be heartily approved. What is objected to is the attempt by the President and others to import into the simple

"Made in Germany"

international principle of neutrality ideas of silence and other elements that are not only foreign to it, but vicious in their nature and mischievous in their consequences.

A mighty nation of one hundred millions of people sees its own and the laws of all governments openly flouted, the peaceable inhabitants of a sister nation slaughtered in cold blood, scores of unoffending merchant ships without a moment's notice torpedoed by pirates and sunk, carrying down men, women and children, and when witnessing this spectacle of fiendish brutality and terrible suffering that curdles the blood and fills us with maddening indignation, are we to be told that neutrality requires the people to be neutral in their thoughts and the government to keep perfectly silent? Sympathetic neutrality answers yes; we answer no.

Sympathetic neutrality eliminates all moral considerations. It would see nothing wrong in the attitude or acts of any of the belligerents. It would treat them all alike. It puts the robber and the robbed, the guilty and the innocent, in the same catalogue and would extend sympathy alike to all. The position was well illustrated at a certain meeting. A resolution was offered endorsing Jesus Christ. A brother would not consent to its passage unless a section was added specifying that nothing in the resolution shall be construed as reflecting on the devil.

Perhaps the ablest advocate of sympathetic

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

neutrality is Dr. David Starr Jordan. In an address at Springfield, Massachusetts, as reported in the Republican, Dr. Jordan relieves all the belligerents from the responsibility for the war. He declared that the attitude of the United States should be one of "Sympathetic neutrality." He says, "No one dares to claim the credit for this war." He has overlooked the claim made in "The Truth About Germany" by eleven representative Germans as follows, "The Kaiser had the moral courage to assume the responsibility of beginning the conflict." Overwhelming testimony to the same effect is presented in the first chapter, "Made in Germany."

We read again, "Servia did not start it." "Russia does not seem to deserve the blame for starting it." "Hundreds of my German friends have told me that Germany did not start it." "Belgium was not to blame for the war." "England is not responsible." "France, far weaker in numbers than Germany, did not want war."

According to this view none of the belligerents were to blame for the war. Nobody started it! It is a phenomenon to be classed with the earthquake, flood or lightning, as wholly independent of men and for which they are in no wise responsible. Does Dr. Jordan or anybody else really believe this? If it is true, there is no question of right or wrong involved any more than there would be in a stroke of light-

"Made in Germany"

ning. If this is true, if men are not responsible, then another war may start itself at any time and human laws, peace organizations, or other preventive measures would have no more effect in preventing it than in preventing an earthquake. Does any one really believe that men can fall upon and murder their innocent neighbors without moral guilt?

We appreciate Dr. Jordan's contribution of time and talent to the cause of peace, but we firmly believe that men are responsible for this war and only the dynamic of Christian ethics will ever make men love peace and hate war. Furthermore, we think that a group of individuals forming a military oligarchy headed by the Kaiser believed in this war, wanted it, prepared for it, started it, forced it upon other nations, refused their entreaties to stop it, and are solely responsible for it, and should be held to a strict accountability at the hands of outraged law, justice and humanity.

Dr. Jordan says, "*Military efficiency caused the war.*" This "efficiency" is such, as we shall see, that it removes all responsibility for the war from men or nations; hence it is to be taken literally and not as a figure of personification. This brings no relief. "Efficiency" is impersonal. It has no moral character. It cannot do right or wrong, and is not, therefore, responsible. Back of "efficiency" there is ultimate personality, intelligence and responsibility.

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

A few days before the war broke out, we stood looking down into the crater of Vesuvius already emitting jets of steam and smoke which preceded the eruption a few weeks later. What caused the eruption? Would Dr. Jordan say, "volcanic efficiency"? But that explains nothing. "Efficiency" is merely an agency, never an agent. Who is behind "volcanic efficiency" and the cause of it? The answer is, the living God. The only alternative is atheism with its dismal philosophy.

The doctrine that "military efficiency" caused the war opens the way for declaring that all the belligerents are its innocent victims and alike entitled to our sympathy. This is "sympathetic neutrality."

We cannot allow its advocates any monopoly of sympathy. We sympathize with the sufferings of all our fellow men whether friends or foes, innocent or guilty, and in punishment we would have "mercy season justice," but that punishment must be commensurate with guilt is ordained of God and man as essential to the existence of society. Punishment should never be inflicted in a revengeful or vindictive spirit, but rather with infinite pity and sorrow.

If "military efficiency" is to blame for the war it alone should pay the penalty. The final sentence should be that "military efficiency" pay a fine of two billion dollars and stand committed to imprisonment until the fine is paid or, if the extreme penalty is imposed and

"Made in Germany"

it were possible to execute it, that "military efficiency" be hanged by the neck until dead. Belgium might demur at the sentence but Germany would submit, if she did not offer to serve as hangman.

We do not deny that "military efficiency" was an agency in bringing on the war, although it was shown in the chapter on armaments that wars were far more numerous before than since the date of great armaments; what we object to is the attempt to transfer the blame from guilty man to his military machine. It is as if George Washington, when a lad and taken to task for cutting down a cherry tree, had replied, "I ground my little hatchet and the hatchet did it with its sharpened edge. I cannot tell a lie, father, *Hatchet Efficiency* cut down the tree. I did not do it and am in no way to blame!"

The doctrine of "military efficiency" as the cause of the war is the handmaid of sympathetic neutrality. It is, however, not only morally vicious, but a logical fallacy and a denial of axiomatic truth. It presents us with a tremendous effect without any real cause. It assures us that eight or ten nations are engaged in a war that was never started by anybody. We see thousands of innocent men, women and children murdered, but there is no murderer; we see great conflagrations consuming public buildings and houses, but there is no incendiary; there are robberies, but no

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

robbers; in a word, we *have in this war the most ghastly crime of the ages but no criminal.*

This doctrine confounds moral distinctions in blaming the innocent and the guilty alike. For example, the author says, "For several years we have seen the armed nations in a situation like that of trains on converging tracks rushing at each other." When, we ask, has he seen little Belgium "rushing" at Germany, or Servia "rushing" at Austria? By what act has France or Russia appeared like a train "rushing" at Germany? Can he point to a single English train "rushing" toward Germany? Dropping the figure, what the world now sees is, that for years, Germany has been literally laying railroad tracks over barren regions, all converging toward the frontiers of Belgium and Russia, and over these tracks she is now "rushing" her trains loaded with troops for aggressive warfare. K/

What disturbs us in Dr. Jordan's "sympathetic neutrality" is its profound silence respecting all moral considerations involved in the war. He dwells on the "folly" of war, its "cost" and loss of human stock, but has not a word to say about the abhorrent immorality, the infamous crime and detestable wickedness of the men who brought on the war. The Christian world is thinking of the cries of men torn asunder, writhing in agony and dying on the battle-field, the cruelties, sufferings and murders, the wrecked homes and hopes, the

"Made in Germany"

broken hearts that refuse to be comforted—these are the things the iniquity of which stirs the blood of men and moves the heart of the Almighty. Compared with these all the mere follies of the world, all the money on earth, combined with all conceivable loss, as loss only, of human stock, have not a feather's weight. "Sympathetic neutrality" led Dr. Jordan to say, "Our duty as a nation outside of the conflict is to know the truth. It is not for us to be pro-France, pro-German, or pro-England. *We must not be pro or anti anything.*"

This declaration is remarkable for its boldness. It sweeps away at one stroke every moral consideration involved in the war. For us there must be no such thing as justice or injustice, truth or falsehood, right or wrong, innocence or guilt in the beginning, conducting or ending of the war; or if these things exist, we must not be for or against them! "We must not be pro or anti anything!" We might dismiss this dictum with the words of Emerson, "Immoral conclusions spare us much trouble in examining the argument." We will, however, give briefly a few reasons for rejecting this position.

(1) It is inconsistent to say in one breath, "It is our duty to . . . know the truth," and then when we have found it to say, "*We must not be for or against it.*" This would be "to hold the truth in unrighteousness."

(2) The strictest construction of the inter-

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

national law of neutrality makes no such demand. Neutrality refuses material aid to either side. It does not require neutrality in thought, feeling or speech either on the part of the government or citizens.

(3) A still higher authority has this to say about pseudo neutrality. "He that is not for me is against me." That is, he that is not for the truth is against it. "Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good." "Woe to them that call evil good and good evil."

(4) As moral beings men cannot be indifferent to good and evil. When they have decided what is right and what is wrong, conscience demands that they be *for the one and against the other*.

(5) In saying without qualification that, "We should not be pro or anti anything," the author virtually says we should not be pro-God or anti-Satan; pro-murder or anti-murder; pro-war or anti-war; and yet he declares himself to be strongly pro-peace and anti-war!

This declaration staggers us. How shall we account for it? It seems to us that it is due to mental and moral astigmatism, to a blinding partiality for Germany. If he merely intended to emphasize the importance of our neutrality, his language should have stopped short of language that carries him almost if not quite into the camp of German apologists, whose inconsistencies, assumptions and sophistries are so

"Made in Germany"

patent and puerile as to excite wonder and disgust in the American mind.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES RESPECTING THE WAR

The vastness of our territory, population and wealth, the virility, liberty, intelligence and enterprise of the people, and above all, the high standards of religion and morality that prevail and will be maintained, in spite of temporary drawbacks, combine to make us as a nation the foremost power in the world.

No higher compliment was ever paid us than the recent statement of Earl Grey in London; he said, "The present conflict probably would never have taken place, had the policy of American pacifists, that the signatory nations to the Hague conventions should undertake collective responsibility for the enforcement of international laws, been adopted." He further says, "*The neutral powers who signed the Hague conventions missed a great opportunity by not protesting against the violation of the international regulations that occurred in this war, which probably would have led to a diminution of its horrors.*"

The neutral powers not only "missed a great opportunity," *they neglected a duty.* This is the point to be emphasized. This is where the United States has signally failed. Our position among the nations, the fact that we proposed at the Hague the very measure that

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

might have prevented this crime, show that we were alive to the importance of maintaining the international laws of war, and the fact that we signed the conventions, thereby agreeing to uphold these laws, renders our failure to protest the more culpable and humiliating.

Had we stoutly protested at the outset of the war, other neutral nations would in all probability have followed our example, for they look to us to take the lead in maintaining neutral rights.

The one neutral right above all others in importance is to have the international laws of war observed by all the belligerents. Great indeed is the responsibility resting upon the United States in this world crisis to maintain the integrity and sovereignty of law. She owes it to herself and to her basal principle that *Liberty is obedience to law*. She owes it to the belligerents tempted to violate international law in this awful struggle, and she owes it to the world to protest against every infraction of those laws that, only after centuries of humane and Christian effort, prompted by the highest aspirations and hopes of the race for unity, brotherhood and love, have crystalized into international law, which we should keep constantly in mind, is the common law of the land.

The failure to protest against the infraction of this law, if as Earl Grey says, it might have mitigated the horrors of war, is one of those

"Made in Germany"

blunders that is worse than a crime. It makes the United States responsible for deeds of revolting barbarism. It arraigns us before the grand jury of the world for international infidelity. It is a betrayal of humanity with the kiss of diplomacy, and the denial of Christ in the house of his friends. It is treason against international morality and makes us *particeps criminis* in the invasion of Belgium and in all the horrors that have followed.

It may help us to see ourselves as others see us to quote the Toronto "Globe" as reported in the Outlook: "There is something morally wrong with the man, whether Canadian or American, who can picture the indescribable sufferings of the Belgian people, without a sense of rage and indignation at those responsible for that ruthless and calmly deliberated crime. There would be something wrong, cowardly and criminal in the Canadian nation if, under the circumstances, Canada did not at once and to the last power, strike for Belgium's defence and for the defence of innocence and the preservation of honor among the nations. More than that, the civilized world will convict the American Republic of wrong and of cowardice and of complicity in the worst international crime since Napoleon's unpardoned offence, if that free nation, itself the heir of all the ages of struggle for liberty, does not soon, and in terms the world will understand, make straight and solemn protest, in the name of

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

international law, to the world's court of public opinion against Germany's violation of international agreements, to which the United States was a pledged party. . . . A nation that loves righteousness is under compulsion to *adjure* iniquity."

The doctrine that neutrality, under international law, does not permit of protests when the rights of humanity are violated, while it permits of protests when the rights of commerce are violated, is a piece of sophistical depravity.

The United States, notwithstanding her neutrality, has repeatedly protested against interference with our trade. On what ground? Because such interference was in violation of international law. If such violation calls for protest in one case, why not in another? It is replied that it is our duty to protect American property and lives, but not the property and lives of other nations. The first clause is right; the last is wrong.

By the Hague conventions we made a treaty with other nations, that we would insist upon the observance of certain rules and regulations, in case of war, for the protection of the citizens of belligerent nations. In other words, we have agreed to help protect the lives and property of other nations. The United States and Germany both signed that treaty.

Travel, commerce and migrations have knit all nations together. When one suffers all suf-

"Made in Germany"

fer. The principle that no man liveth unto himself is equally true of nations. They are one family under the shelter of international law. The attempt, under the plea of neutrality, to escape the obligation of this law to prevent the sufferings of our fellow men, and then to claim its benefits for the protection of our commerce, is dishonorable.

Entirely apart from the Hague conventions, it should be noted that international laws have a binding force as well as treaties. Unless, therefore, we are to adopt the perfidious doctrine that a treaty is only "a scrap of paper," we are in honor bound to protest against every violation of international law, and the failure to do so is likely to be ascribed to diplomatic pusillanimity and moral cowardice.

Many who object to protests, save such as relate to property, enlarge upon the great opportunity that will come to President Wilson as mediator between the warring nations. It is an unfortunate view. It suggests that by acquiescing in the lawlessness and brutalities of the war, the nations will be more likely to accept the mediatorial offices of our President. This is a humiliating thought. It would be doing evil that good might come. President Wilson is a high-souled man, but his idea of neutrality has no sanction in international law. It is strained. It is immoral and impossible. It has made the United States, more than any other neutral nation, responsible for crimes

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

and barbarities that shock the world, and leave an indelible stain upon the pages of history. It has encouraged a course of international lawlessness that is now coming home to plague us in the destruction of our commerce and in endangering the lives of our citizens. Under the guise of neutrality, we have been playing fast and loose with the principles of morality and we must now take the consequences. Such has been the result of the failure to protest against the violation of international law.

We are not criticising the President's political neutrality. This he has maintained with signal ability. It is his attempt at moral neutrality that has contributed to the horrors of the war and involved him in serious moral entanglements. For example, it leads him to say, "No nation is fit to sit in judgment upon any other nation." Has he not sat "in judgment" upon the acts of England and Germany in repeated protests? When he reviewed Germany's submarine policy, protested against it, and threatened to hold Germany to strict account for the loss of American ships or lives, did he do this without exercising any judgment in the matter, on the ground that "No nation is fit to sit in judgment upon any other nation?"

The President is even more unfortunate in saying, "Our whole duty is summed up in the motto, '*America first!*'" On the contrary, our whole duty is summed up in the motto, *Right-*

"Made in Germany"

eousness first! Before America, comes justice and humanity. "America first" is next of kin to the abominable motto, "My country, right or wrong." The President ignores what is
? fundamental and eternal in human relations and substitutes selfishness. Our religion puts God our Father and man our brother first. The world's highest genius said, "Think of thyself last," and this note of altruism is echoed on every page of the New Testament.

The President involves himself in another entanglement in saying, "The basis of our neutrality is sympathy for mankind." How can this be true? How can one say in the same breath, "Our whole duty is summed up in the motto, 'America first,' " and then, "the basis of our neutrality is sympathy for mankind"? Selfishness and sympathy are not traveling companions. No, the basis of our neutrality is not "sympathy" but selfishness.

When in defiance of our treaties and laws, peaceful Belgium is invaded, her cities burned and her inhabitants slaughtered in cold blood, it is not a neutrality of sympathy, but a neutrality of selfishness that freezes the administration's heart and seals its lips against these outrages.

The greatest opportunity of President Wilson's administration and of his life lay open to him, and may not yet be closed,— the opportunity to place this great nation at the head of the honor roll of nations, by sounding the trum-

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

pet call of law and justice, of humanity and righteousness. Like the shot at Concord it would be heard round the world and remembered through all time.

Our President may not be invited to act as mediator. If the feeling should gather strength that he has been seeking the personal honor and glory of such an office, and has sacrificed moral convictions in the interest of his candidacy, he will not be invited to serve as mediator.

The one thing that the United States and all neutral nations should do, and do at once, is to enter a strong and solemn protest against the violation of the rules of war as prescribed by international law.

The following resolutions were adopted in Boston, December 7, 1914, by a body of ministers whose high standing would command appreciation by their fellow citizens everywhere. They express so well the sentiments of the American people that we quote them *in extenso*.

Whereas, by the Articles of the Second Hague Convention, it was expressly stipulated as follows:—

Article I. The territory of neutral powers is inviolable.

Article II. Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or convoys of either munitions of war or supplies across the territory of a neutral power.

"Made in Germany"

Article X. The fact of a neutral power resisting even by force attempts to violate its neutrality cannot be regarded as a hostile act.

Article L. No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals, for which they cannot be regarded as jointly and severally responsible.

And Whereas it appears that Germany and the United States of America, with other great powers, were signatory to these conventions and, therefore, partners in creating them, and in thus creating and signing pledged themselves to use at least all possible moral force for the enforcing of such conventions,

And Whereas it appears that Germany has violated each of the above, if not others as well, in that she has violated the neutrality of Belgium, has transported troops, etc., across her neutral territory, has punished her resistance as a hostile act and taken vengeance on her as though she were an enemy and a belligerent, has at Vise, Louvain and Brussels exacted severe penalties, both in money and life for the acts of individuals;

Therefore be it **RESOLVED**, That we regret exceedingly that after a period of four months no remonstrance has been issued from the United States against this breach of faith, not only with a neutral power but also with the other nations who were partners with her, leaving it possible for history to judge that

Rights and Duties of Neutrality

we look upon those conventions as "mere scraps of paper,"

And be it further **RESOLVED**, That we urge and, so far as we have the right, demand that our representatives and the authorities upon whom such duties devolve, shall make all necessary investigation as to the accuracy of the facts stated above, and if they shall be found to be true, that the United States of America shall immediately thereafter file with the German Empire, and the other nations who were signatory to the Articles of the Hague Convention, our positive remonstrance against the violation of the neutrality of Belgium and this violation of the partnership with our nation in that solemn Treaty.

CHAPTER V

GERMAN CULTURE

CULTURE AND THE WAR

What has culture to do with war? Much every way in Germany. To an American, culture and war seem unrelated. One might as well talk of chemistry and war or mathematics and war. In Germany, however, culture plays an important part in the war. The highest authority declares that the war is waged in behalf of culture. Bernhardi says, "The Germans must, regardless of the rights and interests of other peoples, fight their way to predominance and *force upon humanity their culture and spirit.*"

"Only war," writes Professor Munsterberg, "can adjust the power of countries to the changing stages of their inner development (culture)."

The Kaiser speaks as follows: "Only the German is left to defend and above all to cultivate great conceptions."

"Germany and the Next War," by Bernhardi, says, "War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture."

A learned professor writes, "Germany has

German Culture

the highest culture and is entitled to the hegemony of the continent."

Professor Rudolf Eucken bitterly reproaches England for having made war on German culture, which demanded "The necessary advance through Belgian territory." This "advance" was in behalf of her "culture," which she now proposes to force upon the world.

Dr. Stanton Coit of London, a great admirer of German culture, declares that, "Germany erred in attempting to spread her culture by the bayonet."

These and scores of similar statements would seem to show that the one great object of Germany in beginning this war was to force upon the world her culture. We shall offer some suggestions on this point at the conclusion of this chapter.

CULTURE DEFINED

America knows nothing of any such culture as is implied in the foregoing paragraphs. In America culture means, "enlightenment acquired by mental and moral training; refinement in manners and taste."

Dr. Coit says, "No nation is so lacking in a kind of culture that means delicacy of taste as Germany." In Germany culture means "the employment of all the devices of man for the benefit of the community." In addition to art, literature, philosophy and language, special emphasis is laid upon physical and mechanical

"Made in Germany"

science and its application to industry. It sustains intimate relations with beer, sausage, potatoes and rye bread. With the Germans efficiency is culture. In America culture is the flower garden of the farm; in Germany it is the farm itself.

Professor Rudolf Eucken, a foremost ethical philosopher of Germany, says, *"To us more than to any other people is entrusted the true structure of human existence; as an intelligent people we have, irrespective of creed, worked for soul depth in religion, for scientific thoroughness, for the creation of independent personality in our educational methods. . . . All this constitutes possessions of which mankind cannot be deprived."*

Notwithstanding the vagueness and conceit of this declaration, it is undoubtedly true that the "possessions" or "goods" that constitute German culture may all be grouped under the three heads of "Scientific thoroughness," "Soul Depth in religion," and "Independent personality in educational methods."

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE

"The whole realm of human knowledge has been concentrated in the German brain." So writes Bernhardt, whose book has been called the Bible of Germany. Any doubt from any source about this estimate of the "German brain" would be, to the German, only proof of its correctness. We observe in passing, that

German Culture

Bernhardi's book has so shocked the world, outside of Germany, that German apologists, as represented by Dr. Bernhard Dernberg, now assure us that "Bernhardi was retired from the service just because his writings did not meet with the approval of his superiors." We reply first, that no evidence is offered in support of this assertion; second, Bernhardi has passed the age of sixty-five when army officers are retired; third, and quite conclusive, in the beginning and prosecution of the war, the German army has defied the legal and humane rules of war, and adopted to the letter the cruel, brutal and grossly immoral principles and practices prescribed by Bernhardi. u/

Falling off a few points from Bernhardi's unique estimate of the "German brain," Dr. Dernberg says, "Germany stands in the first rank of applied science." Competent judges deny this. We have never observed from any source a disposition to detract from Germany's scientific culture. On the contrary, America at least has been proud of Germany's attainments in this respect. We have rejoiced at the way in which she has applied scientific principles to industry and labor. We have unfeigned admiration for her system of municipal administration, her protection of the people by means of insurance against accident, sickness, old age and widowhood. In these and other respects, we recognize Germany's "scientific thoroughness." It is conceded that Germany u/

"Made in Germany"

excels in scientific organization, in method and in plodding application. The German mind, however, is not original, inventive or acute; but slow, profound and unyielding. This accounts for its painstaking thoroughness.

We Americans have a habit of admiring anything from abroad. Label an article "imported" and its price was enhanced even though it was inferior to the home-made article. This habit was not limited to material goods, but extended to all departments of culture in art, science and literature. The fact that anything was from abroad was accepted as evidence of superiority. But the tables are now turned. This war has opened our eyes. We begin to see that American "possessions" or "goods," in respect to those ideals that alone make life worth living, are far superior to those of Germany.

We have said that the assertion that "Germany stands in the first rank in applied science" is disputed by competent judges. In applied science respecting improvements in comfort, convenience and conditions of life, Germany is far behind France, England or the United States. The superiority of German culture so loudly proclaimed and widely accepted, is now seen to exist quite largely in the overweening conceit and braggadocio illustrated in the assertion that, "All knowledge is concentrated in the German brain."

An illuminating joint article by Dr. Agnes

German Culture

Replier and Dr. J. William White, published in the Boston Herald, affirms that neither in "chemistry, electrics or medicine, can the German claim to superiority be admitted or even considered. . . . But what of the telephone, the telegraph, the steam-boat, the automobile, the railroad, the phonograph, the electric light, the sewing machine, the photograph, the reaper and binder? "

The same article declares that "Germany borrows from others." In all these directions and many more, including even the latest instruments of war, "the submarine, the torpedo, the revolving or disappearing gun, the machine gun, the turreted ship, Germany has been the exploiter of discoveries or inventions of other races."

Antiseptic surgery, pronounced the greatest discovery of modern times, is due, as this article says, to France and England, while anæsthesia is due to America. All the combined discoveries of Germany in medicine cannot equal the benefits due to anæsthesia and antiseptics.

No less an authority than Professor John Trowbridge, President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, says in the Atlantic Monthly, that Germany now occupies only the third place in science. He concedes Germany's leadership in organic chemistry, but in "physical science, mathematics and physical chemistry" that make demands upon the highest

"Made in Germany"

powers of the mind, England is assigned the first place.

Roger Bacon was the founder of physics; he also first outlined the principle of the telescope. Young's "undulatory theory of light was one of the greatest contributions ever made to science." Rumford showed that "heat was its exact equivalent in motion." Faraday was "the father of the great practical employments of electricity." "It is a fact that the great physical hypotheses have been Anglo-Saxon in origin."

It is claimed that scientific culture cannot flourish in an era of militarism. Germany's greatest scientific progress was in a time of comparative peace between 1840 and 1870. Professor Trowbridge says that since Sedan, Germany has fallen into third place. During this period, however, England contributed Maxwell's electric dynamic theory of light, and England and France laid the foundations of the new great subject of radio-activity. Germany's discovery of the X-rays he calls "a fortuitous accident." None of her discoveries, however, equal Lord Rayleigh's construction of argon. Francis Bacon established the doctrine of inductive reasoning. Newton discovered the law of gravitation. "In scientific culture, exemplified by the use of the imagination, by mathematical knowledge and by philosophical insight leading to the performance of crucial experiments, Great Britain stands first."

German Culture

The new handbook, "Who's Who in Science," gives the number of scientists in the different countries as a test of civilization. The United States has 1,678; England, 1,472; Germany, 1,280; France, 423; Austria-Hungary, 236; Italy, 215; Switzerland, 214; Holland, 155; Sweden, 109; Russia, 97; Denmark, 94; Belgium, 90; Norway, 88; Portugal, 49; Spain, 41. The small countries of Western Europe make relatively the best showing.

The number of scientists to each million of the population is given as follows:—Switzerland, 155; Sweden, 109; Russia, 97; Denmark, 94; Belgium, 90; Norway, 88; Portugal, 49; Spain, 41. The small countries of Western Europe make relatively the best showing.

If these figures are correct or approximately so, it will be seen that Germany occupies only sixth place in rank.

Professor Warren Fite who was a student in Germany, from personal knowledge says, in the New York Nation, as quoted by The Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican, "German science is a gift of moderate value . . . and of rather bourgeois intellectual quality. . . . Germans are the newly lettered, the newly sophisticated and alas! the newly rich." He compares Berlin with Chicago and says the latter is not so proud of its "night life." Others tell us that this "night life" now eclipses Paris in its "stodgy imitators." "In the graduate

"Made in Germany"

school, the Ph.D., and the laboratory of research, the influence of German culture has been somewhat devastating." The only department of culture in which he concedes German supremacy is music. The Republican says, "He might have added that creative supremacy in music has now to be shared with the French and the Russians." "Those Americans," says Professor Trowbridge, "who are loudest in their praise of German culture often argue from an imperfect knowledge of the history of science."

In applied science the United States is making rapid progress. Neither Germany nor any other country can point to such a monumental work of sanitary science as is presented by the Panama canal. A vast region of tropical marsh, swarming with disease-carrying mosquitoes and reeking with poisonous miasma, that has claimed tens of thousands of human lives, was converted by the United States into one of the most sanitary and salubrious places in the world.

In the United States, which has given little attention to armaments, has just been completed the largest dreadnought and the largest cannon in the world. The latter is fifty-six feet in length and throws a shell weighing twenty-four hundred pounds a distance of twenty-one miles. It is for the defence of the Panama canal. We are not, however, proud of it. We will not boast of it and if it should

German Culture

ever be used against an enemy we would have it draped in mourning.

Germany attributes her rapid material development to her own scientific efficiency; but the facts abundantly show the truth of Professor Franklin H. Gidding's assertion that, "The rapid material progress of Germany is largely the result of the liberal trade policy of the British Empire."

It may be that in this brief comparison of the scientific culture of Germany with that of other nations, we have not done the former full justice; but it certainly justifies us in characterizing the claim that "The whole realm of human knowledge has been concentrated in the German brain" as puerile bombast, and especially in regarding the claim that the highest scientific culture is a "sacred possession" entrusted to Germany alone, and to be forced upon the nations by German bayonets, as a piece of vanity, insanity and asininity that has no counterpart in modern history.

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CULTURE

Another element of culture in "the true structure of human existence," which Professor Eucken says is specially entrusted to Germans, he designates as "*Soul depth in Religion.*"

In any intelligent discussion there must be something agreed upon to start with. Just as in a race there must be a starting point

"Made in Germany"

common to all the competitors, so in discussion, certain underlying principles, propositions or definitions must be held in common and agreed upon as a starting point by all disputants. For example, in any discussion of religion it must be agreed that religion exists, that it is a social institution in all countries and a mighty factor in the world; then disputants may diverge respecting its origin, nature, object, etc.

It is in these respects that we shall find a radical difference between Germans and Americans. Americans believe that religion consists in the worship and service of God. Germans believe that religion, at least very largely, consists in the worship and service of the state or the Kaiser as the supreme power. The Kaiser said to his soldiers, "*You think each day of your Emperor. Do not forget God.*" Treitschke says, "The end all and be all of a state is power." Bernhardi approves the dictum and declares that "*The highest moral duty of a state is to increase its power. The state is the sole judge of the morality of its own action. It is in fact above morality or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral.*"

The supreme judge in morals is here declared to be the state. He thus puts the state in the place of God and spells it with a capital. "Germany stands," says another, "as the supreme arbiter of her own methods." The same of

German Culture

course would be true of every other nation. Thus we have the tribal gods of paganism.

Of course all this would be denied in theory by Germans; but we are not now dealing with theories or professions but with facts and practices. When people say, "The state is the sole judge of morality . . . is in fact above morality," the god of that people is the state and not the God of the Bible or the Christian.

The Kaiser and his entire political, military, educational and ecclesiastical oligarchy subscribe to the doctrine, *Suprema lex regis voluntas*, which, in the last analysis, is the practical enthronement of man as the supreme being. We are not, therefore, surprised to hear Bismarck say, "With us, sir, there is no sovereign but the King. It is he alone who wills," or his brother speak of "The sacred person" of the Kaiser, or the authors of "The Truth About Germany" say that they must follow wherever the Kaiser leads. He is called by the people, "The anointed of the Lord." Can we wonder that the Kaiser says, "*Sic volo, sic jubeo*," or that he assumes the prerogatives of God, or even that he should say in his heart what the greatest of German philosophers said, "If there were a god how should I endure not to be God?"

The paganized ruling classes in Germany still have the Bible, the church, the Christian traditions and forms of worship, as an inheritance, but these have become empty shells

"Made in Germany"

from which the life has departed. Thus, religion, so far from having "Soul depth" is not even skin deep. There are a few genuine Christians among them and many more among the common people, but they have little influence upon a government which has taken the place of God.

The unscrupulousness and brutality of Germany in the beginning and carrying on of this war have revealed as nothing else could have done the true character of her religion and morality. We can now account for the strange, anti-Christian sayings and writings of eminent Germans in the past, and for recent utterances of religious leaders respecting the war, which have shocked the Christian and even the pagan world.

Nietzsche, a brilliant German philosopher, boldly declared that the pagan deity "Odin was greater than God." He deplored Germany's adoption, in the fifth century, of Christianity. He is quoted in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* as follows: "Ye have heard how in old times it was said, Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; but I say unto you, Blessed are the valiant, for they shall make the earth their throne. And ye have heard men say, Blessed are the poor in spirit; but I say unto you, Blessed are the great in soul and free in spirit, for they shall enter into Valhalla. And ye have heard men say, Blessed are the peace-makers; but I say unto you

German Culture

Blessed are the war-makers, for they shall be called, if not the children of Jahve, the children of Odën, who is greater than Jahve." i/

Teaching so repugnant to Christianity would have met with crushing opposition in almost any Christian country. Not so, however, in Germany. While Nietzsche was repudiated by many, his teaching took hold of multitudes who applauded, approved and have now put into practice the spirit and the most vicious features of his teachings.

There is one bed-rock principle in the Christian religion and that is love—love to God and love to man. Upon the rock of brotherhood human society is building and will finally rest, or the world is doomed. What is the German teaching upon this subject? Nietzsche answers, "Brotherhood is for shop-keepers, cows, women and Englishmen." "Ah," it is replied, "Germany repudiates such teachings." Does she? Then listen to one of her latest spokesmen, Bernhardi: "The Christian law of love applies only to individuals of the same state," that is, love stops at the state line, and the Christian God of love becomes a local, state or tribal god of paganism. "Ah," it is replied, "Germany is misrepresented by Bernhardi." Is she? Then listen again; Professor Hugo Münsterberg writes in a book just published as follows, "*It is the grossest immorality that nations should respect the possessions of other nations.*"

"Made in Germany"

This is the horrible teaching of Nietzsche brought up to date. He says, "You should love peace as a means to new war and brief peace more than a long one. Do you say it is a good cause by which a war is hallowed? I say unto you, it is a good war which hallows every cause. War and courage have done greater things than the love of one's neighbor."

We are told that this must not be taken literally but symbolically. Symbolical of what? Belgium is the answer. How futile the attempt to explain away the wicked principles of these German writers, when the German army, before the eyes of the whole world, is daily carrying them out in letter and spirit. An able writer who was for three years a student in Germany assures us, "that the rank and file as well as the aristocracy . . . have become ominously full of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest and the consequent expediency of power, not only in intellectual rivalry but in Krupps and high explosives."

The Kaiser, in his world-empire ambition, comes to the support of this doctrine of seizing other people's possessions by deliberately setting aside the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." The Earl of Halsburg expresses himself in regard to this kind of "soul depth in religion" as follows: "I wish to denounce any man who thinks himself appointed by God to take possession of somebody else's prop-

German Culture

erty. . . . I cannot allow this discussion to pass without raising my voice in opposition to the notion that because a very big crime is committed, it is to be treated as though it was a little crime. Any emperor who wants to take somebody else's land is a dirty thief, and I do not approve of the sort of delicacy which would prevent our expressing ourselves plainly as to actions of that sort. They are actions of which any man should be ashamed . . . by such means you are to carry your grandeur and your glory to the uttermost parts and whether the offender be Napoleon who committed great crimes—or Sennacherib, he ought to be hanged.”

We are beginning to get an insight into the “soul depth in religion,” which Professor Eucken declares to be one of the “holiest possessions” for which Germany is fighting. The German who says, “It is the grossest immorality that nations should respect the possessions of other nations,” is a professor in Harvard University. His assertion is astonishing. It is outrageously unchristian, immoral and brutal. To set such a man to teach American youth is scandalous. All considerations of ability, policy or money weigh as nothing in the face of a declaration that it is “the grossest immorality” not to ravage, plunder and murder an unoffending neighboring people. A more socially anarchistic, morally repulsive and religiously diabolical sentiment was never

"Made in Germany"

uttered on American soil, and it is a thousand pities that it should emanate from Harvard University whose motto is "*Christo et Ecclesiae*." The sentiment is the echo of principles everywhere adopted in Germany and put in practice by her armies in their methods of warfare.

We do not claim that a general induction can be made from particular cases, unless these are clearly representative or have their logical outcome in actual conduct or results.

There is one code of laws universally recognized as of divine authority; this is the Decalogue. Its commandments are the foundation of both natural and revealed religion. The man who denies this divine authority, puts himself outside the pale of all religion. The Kaiser, whose constant appeal to God and the German Sword is offensive to all true Christians, declares as follows: "*The Old Testament includes a large number of chapters the nature of which is purely historical and human and not a revelation from God. I believe, for example, that the proclamation of the law on Mount Sinai must not be considered as having been inspired by God.*" Of course whatever is "purely historical and human" has no divine authority over any man. In this repudiation of the very foundation of all religion, we have another example of Germany's "soul depth in religion"!

In "To the Evangelical Christians Abroad,"

German Culture

thirty-two German ministers say that Austria's war upon Serbia was "*justifiable vengeance for an abominable royal murder.*" It is conceded that the murderer was a subject of Austria; that not a shred of evidence has been offered to show Serbia's complicity in the crime; that Serbia offered to submit the issue to arbitration and that Austria refused and made war upon Serbia. What do the precepts and spirit of Christianity require in such a case? We answer, the trial, conviction and punishment of the murderer and the peaceful arbitration of the issue between Austria and Serbia. What is the answer of the German ministers? "*Justifiable vengeance*" or, unrestrained revenge by means of war. No comment could make plainer the anti-Christian attitude of these ministers. Listen again to them: "*No scruple holds back our enemies where, in their opinion there is a prospect, through our destruction, of seizing for themselves an economic advantage, or an increase of power, a fragment of our mother-land, or our colonial possessions or our trade.*"

We offer three observations respecting these charges.

First. These ministers do not offer a shred of evidence in support of a single one of their charges and they cannot.

Second. There is not the semblance of truth in their statement. No enemy or anyone else has ever suggested the "destruction" of Ger-

"Made in Germany"

many; no "economic advantage" has been seized by anyone; no "fragment of our motherland or colonial possessions" has been sought by any nation; no German "trade has been seized," but Germans have seized the trade of England and other nations right and left. These facts are matters of history and do not admit of dispute.

Third. These ministers are learned men. They know that it is not merely sophistical, but morally indefensible to make serious charges of wrong doing, without any pretense of furnishing evidence to support them. *It is a case of bearing false witness.*

As love is the essential principle of Christianity, so hatred is its extreme opposite. We hold that no man can be a Christian who deliberately hates a fellow man. There is high authority for this position. It reads as follows: "*If any man say I love God and hateth his brother he is a liar and the truth is not in him.*" When, therefore, the Berlin pastors subscribed to the sentiment of "*nothing but hatred and contempt*" for the English, what are we to think of their Christianity? Just how does their "soul depth in religion" manifest itself toward their neighbors? It will hardly be contended that these pastors are not representative of German religion.

In his admirable work on "The Evidence in the Case," Mr. James M. Beck quotes as follows from Dr. Fuchs, an eminent German, who

German Culture

demands "Education to hate. Education to the estimation of hatred. Organization of hatred. Education to the desire for hatred. Let us abolish unripe and false shame before brutality and fanaticism. We must not hesitate to announce: To us is given faith, hope and hatred, but hatred is the greatest among them." In America this would be the ravings of a mad man. How is it regarded in Germany? Mr. Beck says this man is "a representative physician, a prominent journalist and a distinguished retired officer of the German army." An Oxford professor asks, "What possessed the Germans at Louvain to make a special point of burning the University library and the colleges?" The answer is, hatred. What possessed a German submarine on March 28, 1915, to sink the *Falaba*, a passenger ship, sending one hundred and twenty men, women and children to a watery grave? There is only one answer, hatred.

A German newspaper printed an article by Lieutenant Colonel Kaden in which occurs the following: "Send it reverberating like clanging bells from tower to town throughout the country side: Hate! Hate the accursed English! Hate!"

"When your soul has become great," says Nietzsche, "it will become wanton; in your greatness there will be malice I know, and in malice the proud heart will meet a weakling." The London Express says, "German hatred of

"Made in Germany"

this country is a monomania. If they ever have a chance the Germans will spread havoc and death in Great Britain with a thoroughness compared to which their proceedings in Belgium will appear a mere Sunday-school picnic."

Frederick the Great is reported to have said to his nephew, "To despoil your neighbors is to deprive them of the means of injuring you . . . with regard to war, it is a business in which the slightest scruple spoils the whole matter . . . be sure not only of preserving your kingdom but of enlarging it."

One hundred and fifty years have passed since these barbarous sentiments were uttered. During this time the world has made great progress in civilization, especially in the splendid development of altruism and philanthropy; hence it is that Christendom is shocked at Germany's adoption of these inhuman and savage principles.

Hundreds of similar examples can be given, showing that hatred is an accepted doctrine in Germany, and the last nine months show that it is a working principle in the conduct of this war. Lissauer's "Chant of Hate" is Germany's national hymn and everywhere sung with religious fervor. A cartoon represents leading men of Germany grinding out "Chants of Hate" while you wait, showing the great popularity of the poem.

Since hatred is the extreme opposite of love

German Culture

and brotherhood enjoined by religion, the claim that Germany is distinguished above other nations by "soul depth in religion" is nothing less than grotesque.

This war has led Americans to examine the history and character of German institutions as never before. We could not understand why Germany began this war. The crime of deliberately provoking a war is so monstrous that we were at a loss to account for Germany's action. It seemed to be a war without a cause. The secret is now disclosed. *There was no religion or morality to restrain the rampant militarism.* Instead of "soul depth in religion" we find a religion so shallow that it cannot furnish even a veneering for the basest passions—the lust of "blood and iron."

The doctrine that might makes right is a figment in America, but a reality in Germany. In the new ethics a war of conquest is the wickedest thing conceivable in America, while in Germany it is a virtue. The rise and progress of these vicious principles of militarism have blighted the Christian faith in Germany and religion has lost its hold upon the people.

Mr. Coit, a competent judge and a warm friend of German Kultur, says "Germans do not pretend to be holy, followers of Christ. It is rather the spirit of Napoleon that rules Germany. To reduce a treaty to 'A scrap of paper' is quite consistent with German cul-

"Made in Germany"

ture," and he might have added with German "soul depth in religion"!

The "scrap of paper" incident created a profound sensation throughout the world. Why? It would hardly have found its way into the newspapers so far as its political, diplomatic, or military significance was concerned. *It was because it was a direct and deadly assault upon the citadel of morality and religion.* Had the assault prevailed, had this citadel fallen, all would have been lost, all faith and justice, all law, religion and morals would have been over run, devastated and ruined by the arch enemy of the race. Had men been silent and accepted that principle, the world that has been slowly climbing up the sublime heights of "peace on earth, good will to men" would have relapsed into chaos and despair. In that little "scrap of paper" the German Chancellor, Bethmann Hollweg, represented the Kaiser and the under rulers of Germany. It will stand as the symbol of religious and moral decay of their empire. It led directly to the attempt to bribe England, so epigrammatically set forth by Mr. G. K. Chesterton, "Germany came to England and said if you will break your promise in the hope of helping me to break my promise, I will reward you with another of my celebrated promises, or I am going to lie. If you will lie too, we can both be trusted to tell the truth."

Is it any wonder that we Americans cannot

German Culture

comprehend what the Kaiser means in saying, "*To possess kultur means to have the deepest conscientiousness and the highest morality. My Germans possess that.*" Was it this "conscientiousness" and "morality" that inspired this holy charge to his soldiers, "When you encounter the enemy . . . no quarter shall be given, no prisoners shall be taken"? Was it "soul depth in religion" that led him to say to Mohammedan Turkey, "Proclaim a holy war against my religion and the religion of my people"? By this *reductio ad absurdum* we can now appreciate Germany's "soul depth in religion."

The truth is the vital spark of Christianity has about disappeared in Germany. Theology has been divorced from religion and taken the highest seat in the synagogue. This process has been going on for half a century. True religion, both personal and institutional, must suffer an eclipse when theologians and schools forsake it by substituting a cold, barren intellectualism. ||

The fathers of philosophy, science and music are not the fathers of religion. They are so far from possessing "soul depth in religion" that they are, for the most part, strangers to the soul of religion or the religion of the soul. Religion is a matter of the heart and emotions and cannot be expressed in terms of the intellect. The attempt to do this is fatal. Faith does not "stand in the wisdom of man" but

"Made in Germany"

in "the power of God." Whatever that power is, it is not the power of man. This is denied by German rationalists falsely called theologians.

Dr. W. F. Griffith Thomas, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1915, says, "It is almost incredible to read that, when Harnack endeavored to express his religious convictions in his book, 'The Essence of Christianity,' a well-known theologian, Jülicher, condemned it as not the proper work for a professor. Perhaps greatest of all is the fact that Christ as expressing God has been woefully ignored and neglected in Germany. It is true that the Kaiser has referred to God in various ways almost *ad nauseam*, and the motto on the soldier's belt is 'God with us'; but no one can doubt that the conception of God is Deistic rather than that of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is such a conception as admits of principles subversive of Christianity, such as "*War is a good thing.*" "*The weak have no right to live.*" "*Might makes right.*" "*It is the grossest immorality . . . to respect the possessions of other nations.*" "*Hatred is greater than love.*" It is a conception that permits in war every crime of the Decalogue and tramples upon the Sermon on the Mount, and is as far removed from Christianity as Gehenna is from Paradise.

The higher criticism in Germany has cut away all Biblical moorings and set theologians

German Culture

adrift on the ocean of speculation and left the people without God and without hope in the world. Wellhausen said, "*If my views prevail the common people cannot retain the Bible.*" With theologians apostatized, the Bible discarded, Christ rejected, churches neglected and religion paganized, Germany had to worship something and so she set up the Moloch of Militarism and is now immolating hetacombs of human victims to her idol.

EDUCATIONAL CULTURE

Another characteristic of German culture in that "true structure of human existence" which, according to Professor Eucken has been "entrusted to Germany," is "*The creation of independent personality in our educational methods.*"

Education is a magic word in the United States. The two pillars of our republic are religion and education. The republic is free and enduring just in proportion as the people are religious and intelligent. Some are indifferent respecting scientific culture and some respecting religious culture, but every American, if he is half a man is loyal to the cause of education.

The merits of the German educational system may be at once conceded. Among the things it lacks, the most important is this "independent personality" which is claimed

"Made in Germany"

by Professor Eucken as one of its principal characteristics.

The German army is not inaptly called a machine. Precisely the same is true of education. So far from developing "independent personality" either in the army or in education, the direct opposite is the truth. It is the close formation, the whole as a unit, in either case, that describes the method. In this method the personality of the individual is suppressed in favor of the movement in masses. It is the machine rather than the mechanic that does the work and carries off the honors.

On the other hand educational methods in the United States develop personality. With us it is the mechanic rather than the machine, the man behind the gun rather than the gun, the individual rather than the school that engages chief interest.

The relation of the state to the people will determine the character and methods in education. Where the people exist for the state, education will exist for the state, and the less "independent personality" the better; where the state exists for the people, education exists for the people and the more "personality" the better.

Method, drill, thoroughness and mechanical efficiency in education have reached high-water mark in Germany, but in originality, acuteness, comprehension, personality and independence Germany is far behind England and the United

German Culture

States. Above all, in the amenities of life, politeness, kindness, modesty, gratitude, gentleness, neighborly love and refinement, qualities above all others that must distinguish any educational culture worthy the name, are inconspicuous in Germany.

We have seen in a former chapter that German universities are under state control. The professors are state officers, appointed, paid and disciplined by the state. Since the state and militarism are so nearly synonymous, no wrong impression will be conveyed in saying that the universities and, therefore, all education is under military control. We say all education, because education in Germany is from the top downward. In the United States, it is from the bottom upward. Here the people control the common school, the common school controls the university, and the university controls the government. The whole process is reversed in Germany, where the government controls the university, the university the common school and the schools the people.

If, therefore, the German government would keep up the war spirit of the people against Russia, it has only to communicate its will to the universities and, as Bismarck says, it is their business to ask no questions, but to devise means of carrying out the will of the Kaiser and they will fail to do this at their peril. "The complaisant professor is decorated, the contumacious is cashiered."

"Made in Germany"

We can now understand why the universities invented the bogey of the "Slav menace," which has kept the people up to the boiling point of war against Russia. Professor Simon N. Patten says, "The cry of 'Germany versus Slav' originated in the university, and the professor rules Germany; his idealism has gone to the schools and is firmly implanted in every boy's heart." This "Slav menace," says a writer, was thus "an invention to cover the purpose of conquest."

The story of the origin and object of the "Slav menace," which has no reality in fact but is a mere phantom, illustrates the attitude of the German professors in this war. They are its most ardent apologists and supporters. They have sent an appeal to foreign universities to support the German cause on the ground of culture. They say, "These universities know what German culture means to the world. So we trust they will stand by Germany." Never were the genius and character of American universities more thoroughly misconceived, than by imagining that they would approve or condone the German war—the most perfidious and infamous crime in modern times—for the sake of a culture that has made war its chief element, and should be shunned as we would shun the plague of leprosy. It reminds us of the notorious Ruloff, convicted of murder and sentenced to death in Ohio. A college president visited him in prison. Ruloff con-

German Culture

fessed that he had murdered thirteen persons. He was a linguist and could speak thirteen languages, which happened to be one language for each murder. He gravely argued that his linguistic culture was a "possession" that the world should not lose, that it entitled him to life, and he besought his visitor to intercede for him on this ground. Like these German professors, he virtually said, "You know what linguistic culture means to the world, so I trust you will stand by me!"

The Intellectuals of Germany recently asserted that "German Intellectuals and German soldiers form but one soul, and Goethe, and Kant and Beethoven are our fathers." Soul in Germany means the pagan soul; in America it means the Christian soul. This identification of culture with war is incomprehensible to Americans. They believe that war is a terrible evil, destructive, demoralizing and ruinous to all that culture means.

Where the chief divinity of a nation is Mars, educational culture will naturally honor his heroes. This explains the recently reported act of a German university in conferring the degree of Doctor of Divinity upon General von Hindenberg after a great slaughter of Russians!

The process of militarizing education in Germany has been a gradual one. It began soon after the easy triumph over France in 1871. Flushed with victory and the enormous indem-

"Made in Germany"

nity of a billion dollars exacted from France, Germany began to regard war as the one object of glorification. A national altar was erected to Brute Force, and, forsaking the Christian God of peace and love, the people, led by the Kaiser and the universities, bowed down and worshipped at this shrine. There were misgivings and protests by wise and good men, but without avail. Theodor Mommsen spoke as follows to his constituents at Halle:—"Have a care, gentlemen, lest in this state which has been at once a power in arms and a power in intelligence, the intelligence should vanish and nothing but the pure military state should remain."

From that day to the present time German culture has declined. Her great philosophers and poets belong to a pre-militaristic age. In philosophy, art, science, music and belles-lettres, it is said Germany has fallen to the third if not the fourth place among the nations. For a hundred years or more there has not been a single writer of novels in Germany who equals in literary excellence a group of a dozen English writers.

A far more serious matter in a state that has enthroned militarism as its idol, is the decay of moral culture. We do not share the popular view as to the military virtues, so called. The man who will die for the right is a brave man. The man who will die for the sake of a fight is a brute. His valor is the

German Culture

valor of the beast. In every war there is more of this kind of valor than we like to admit. Militarism in time of peace nourishes the beast in human nature. We are not thinking so much of its disgusting superciliousness and hoggishness, which are notorious on the streets of Berlin, as of the vices that flourish and are condoned, but which sap the virility of the nation. No amount of scientific or other culture can counteract their fatal effects. Commenting on this state a writer says, "Brutal wickedness and misery increased a thousand fold, cause us to repeat Rousseau's prayer, 'Almighty God, deliver us from the sciences and the pernicious arts of our father! Grant us ignorance, innocence, and poverty once more as the only things which can bring happiness and which are of value in thine eyes.'"

The later doctrine of the Superman has been disastrous to German morals. Goethe's "Superman" was one who rose "spiritually and intellectually above the foibles of humanity," and was thus a beautiful conception.

"Unless above himself,
~~Man~~ can erect himself,
How mean a thing is man!"

etc.

Nietzsche, however, caught up Goethe's Superman and made it stand for a big "bully trampling down whatever is not strong enough to resist." In other words, he made it a slogan of militarism. His Superman meant beyond

"Made in Germany"

good and evil, or rather good and evil were no longer to be considered. It transcended morality. Force, power, were the only things worth while, and death to the weak. Nietzsche said, "Weakness is the political sin against the Holy Ghost," although he flouted all religion.

If the Superman is untouched by good and evil, he is to be classed with the lower animals since they also are untouched by good and evil. This shows us not a Superman but a *Subman*, and to this species Nietzsche and all his ilk belong.

The brilliant Boston correspondent of the Springfield Republican (Mass.) says, "Nietzsche undertook to set aside the Ten Hebrew Commandments in favor of his theoretical abstraction, the Superman . . . but his imaginary Nietzschean Superman has turned out, in practice, to be some scandalous Cæsar, Tartar, Turk, or Roman pope, who filled out the schemes devised for him by the poet:—

"Strength should be lord of imbecility.
And the rude son should strike his father dead.
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into Will, Will into Appetite,
And Appetite, a universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make, perforce, a universal prey,
And last, eat up himself.'"

The mischief wrought in Germany by the influence of Nietzsche and his followers is incalculable. To them can be traced the diabol-

German Culture

ical German doctrine, "My country right or wrong." His teachings have poisoned the atmosphere of the throne, the military, the university, the school and the common people with the deadly fumes of militarism until the nation now lies convulsed in the throes of war.

We have said that German education was from the top downward. This insures a unity of system, method, spirit and result possible only to a machine controlled by a master mechanic—the autocratic hand, but it is fatal to "independent personality in education."

By this system, any doctrine, idea, belief or policy at the top can be readily transmitted to the bottom with an efficiency unexcelled by a Corliss engine. By this system, arbitrarily worked from the top, the same efficiency can be secured in industrial operations. The Germans, says another, "have been dragooned into an efficiency by an autocracy for its own selfish ends." Liberty must be sacrificed for this kind of efficiency. "The efficiency of the German machine, brought into light through the present war, has been accomplished only through the autocracy of the state, as autocracy runs hand in hand with purely technical efficiency. The price that must be paid for democracy is a certain amount of technical inefficiency for the benefit of man, as man, and not as a machine. The price is not too high, because democracy develops the independence, the character and the expansion of the indi-

"Made in Germany"

vidual life." Not for a moment would we exchange the liberty, initiation, character and enterprise of American democracy for the servile efficiency of German autocracy.

This system accounts also for the boasted unity of the common people in Germany in support of this iniquitous war; for the unity of the universities in defence of it; for the unity of the 25,000 German soldiers killed and wounded at Liege, in believing that they were fighting Frenchmen on their way to Germany, although there was not a French soldier in Belgium at the time. It accounts also for the unity of the children in the German schools in believing the great lies that are taught them; for example, *that war is divine; that might makes right; that militarism is the corner stone of the state; that other nations are bent on the destruction of Germany; that the Kaiser is the divine head of all nations; that hatred is virtue; that the war is a defensive war, and that Germany has a right to force her culture on the world by the bayonet.*

For more than a generation the children have had these lies drilled into them in the schools and have grown up with them. Worse than all, the paganism of the universities, in the rejection of the Christian God, the Bible, the Christ, and personal religion, has been taught in the schools and resulted in the most irreligious and godless nation in Christendom.

Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas gives us a sample

German Culture

of the teachings in all the schools throughout Germany. The teacher said to his pupils, "*There are also some people who think that every thing good comes from above; that is not true. . . . You must not believe that Jesus really stilled the storm on the sea. He never did that.*" A clergyman present highly commended the teacher, and of twenty other teachers present only one stood up for Christ. We could multiply examples of like teaching, but *ex uno disce omnes*.

There is no test of the true educational and ethical culture of a people at the present time more significant than its missionary work. A letter from the secretary of the oldest missionary society in this country, after speaking highly of German missions in India and the numerous missions of German Lutheranism, makes this significant statement:—"The Germans use only about two million dollars a year, that is, all of the German Missionary Societies together in the prosecution of their work all over the world, while Great Britain uses more than ten million dollars a year and the United States twelve million more."

While missionary activity is primarily religious, its schools, colleges and hospitals, as well as its churches, are doing a highly educational work. We use the word education in this chapter in its broadest sense, including all cultural and intellectual activities.

In one respect "independent personality in

"Made in Germany"

education" may be conceded to Germany. We refer to excursions in the realms of philosophy. There is much useless learning in all countries but Germany leads in this respect. Mr. Charles W. Super calls attention in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* to two recent Greek histories by Busolt and Beloch, written, he says, with characteristic German thoroughness. One of them extending only to the time of Alexander fills about twenty-five hundred pages; the other covers more ground and is more readable, but there is little of value in them. Of the same character, he says, is Macon's *Herodotus*. "After reading all the author has to say, we find that it is almost exclusively subjective and of no real value." Germany abounds in publications of this character, which add nothing to the sum of human knowledge.

Philosophy is no less important than science to the progress and happiness of the race. Science deals with concrete, proximate facts; philosophy with abstract, ultimate facts. As with science so in philosophy, the moment one departs from facts ascertained by exact observation and correct reasoning, that moment he embarks upon a sea of speculation and without rudder, anchor or compass, is driven hither and thither by every wind that blows. Metaphysics, said J. S. Mill, is a fertile field of delusion propagated by language.

In no department of education is there such an unquenchable thirst as in matters of reli-

German Culture

gion. Anything or anybody that claims to possess a key to unlock its mysteries, or an idea to solve its problems, can command the attention of the world. Germany, the land of Luther and Melancthon, was supposed to be the promised land flowing with the milk and honey of religious truth. Thither thousands of American theological students have gone to complete their equipment for the Gospel ministry. In some respects they may have been benefitted. In many respects they have been injured. In no respect have they been endued with more power in prayer, more humility, spirituality or converting grace, things without which a church is only an æsthetical, intellectual and pharisaical club.

The "independent personality" of which Germany boasts has indeed characterized the speculations of her theologians. Nowhere in Christendom has independence of all law, authority and truth been so destructive of the Bible. Nowhere has the repudiation of the supernatural and divine been so thorough. Nowhere has Christ been so thoroughly rejected. Nowhere have love, humility, prayer, forgiveness and all the Christian graces been so discredited and crushed by "independent personality" and "scientific thoroughness."

No nation has been so fertilized and seeded down with arrogance, infidelity, immorality, hatred and militarism as Germany; and having thus sown the wind, she is bound to reap

"Made in Germany"

a whirlwind of suffering, lamentation and woe. We are told that Americans do not understand Germany because they "cannot think like Germany." The late Charles Francis Adams, after reading Nietzsche and other German writers, says, "I can only say that if what I find in these sources is the capacity to think Germanically, I would rather cease thinking at all. It is the absolute negation of everything which has in the past tended to elevate mankind, and the installation in place thereof of a system of thorough dishonesty, emphasized by brutal stupidity. There is a low cunning about it too, which is to me in the last degree repulsive."

The people of other nations are less annoyed at the philosophical vagaries of the Germans than at their assumption of superiority. Several years ago Mr. Herman Ridder, an able German editor in the United States, wrote as follows: "If Germany to-day in general is unbeloved and is able so easily to become suspected, the first and principal reason for this is the provocative activity of the pan-Germans, their vainglory and their mania for treating other powers with mortifying insolence."

This German trait is not a recent or sudden development. It has been going on for many years. The Kaiser is especially responsible for it.

His exaltation of himself could not be realized without the exaltation of his subjects.

German Culture

Constantly falling from his lips are the phrases, "My unrivaled Grandfather"; "My glorious house of Hohenzollern"; "The Spirit of God has descended upon me." The royal members of his family are exalted far above all other mortals. He has assured the people that they are superior in kultur, bravery and power, to all other people and that God has decreed that Germany should force her kultur, at the point of the bayonet, upon all other nations. "*The foreigner*," he says, "*has learned the consequences of offending the German Emperor and his soldiers.*"

This balderdash has had an immense effect upon the people. We know how easy it is to spoil a child by telling him he is superior to other children and even to his parents and that others should submit to his will. The child is inflated with self-importance and insolence. Precisely similar has been the effect of the Kaiser's fulsome praise of the people. They have taken him seriously until the average German is a bundle of conceit and arrogance. An American and German at the beginning of the war chanced to be passing the Capitol buildings in Washington. The German innocently remarked that some day the German Emperor would own these buildings and control them.

The same assumption of superiority has manifested itself in German universities. Mr. Charles W. Super quotes Professor Kaster as saying, respecting students from other prov-

"Made in Germany"

inces and foreign lands, "We take the donkey's money and send him home." In his colossal conceit he could not realize that the pabulum he dispensed was more suitable for a donkey's consumption than for high minded young men in pursuit of knowledge. The "money," however, has had a diplomatic effect upon the professor in his concealing his insolence.

One thing has already resulted from this war, namely, the glamour that has heretofore enveloped German universities is dissolved. The disillusionment has come. When at the beginning of the war German professors came out boldly as the ardent champions of militarism, war for conquest and the spread of German kultur, they challenged the world to examine the reserve of true scholarship behind the university currency in general circulation, and people found the latter so inflated that its slump in value is universal and its redemption doubtful.

The ideals of the universities, their philosophies, researches, kultur and morals, their teachings, spirit and purpose, however disguised, had all fostered the wicked and detestable purpose of aggressive war.

This assumption of superiority easily grows out of the spirit of militarism and helps to account for the hatred of Germans toward their enemies. But how shall we explain this hatred on the part of learned men, professors with chastened experience and disciplined minds?

German Culture

Hatred of one's fellow men is one of the basest passions. What could lead an eminent professor of Heidelberg to declare that German culture would not be satisfied until it had destroyed the tombs of Shakespeare and Newton as a punishment upon perfidious London? Incredible as it may appear, there is no doubt that these professors, were it possible, would march in a body to Stratford-on-Avon and burn the home of Shakespeare, dig up his bones and throw them into the Avon, and raze to the ground the church in which he worshipped.

This is Germany and this is German kultur in German universities in the twentieth century!

Science and philosophy may be a source of weakness as well as power. The defeat of Germany will be the defeat of her universities. It will be a signal defeat of the maxim, knowledge is power. It will show once again that knowledge without wisdom is in the long run weakness and destruction.

"Knowledge is proud that it learned so much,
Wisdom is humble that it knows no more."

There is the very highest authority for the doctrine that the beginning of wisdom is not the university but the fear of God who, however, has been for a generation virtually banished from German universities.

It would seem to be a solecism to speak of the ignorance of learned men; this war, how-

"Made in Germany"

ever, has emphasized the fact. This is an age of specialization in knowledge. Specialization has serious disadvantages. It dwarfs the mind by sharpening some faculties at the expense of others. "It is a matter for profound regret," writes Mr. Super, "that the old-time scholarship has become almost a thing of the past," and he quotes a pupil of the late Professor Shaler as saying, "I do not believe there is an American now living under sixty years of age whose knowledge is as extensive and accurate as his was."

While the saying that we should know everything about something and something about everything may not be taken literally, scholars are certainly bound to know the great outstanding facts connected with public events of supreme importance.

Well-educated Germans believe that three years ago the increase of their army was forced by an increase of the French army, whereas it is a plain historical fact that the exact opposite is the truth, viz.: Germany first enlarged her army by more than half a million soldiers, and France, to meet the danger, then increased her army.

Ninety-three of the best educated men in Germany address a letter to all nations in which they say, "It is not true that Germany . . . caused the war . . . Germany did her utmost to prevent it." No historical fact is more solidly established than that this war was

German Culture

planned in Germany, prepared in Germany and "Made in Germany." If these gentlemen are sincere in their statements they are profoundly ignorant of the facts. They say again, "It is not true that we trespassed in neutral Belgium," and again, "It is not true that the life and property of a single Belgium citizen was injured by our soldiers without the bitterest self-defence having made it necessary," and again, "It is not true that our warfare pays no respect to international laws," and this in the face of their submarine piracy! We could fill pages with similar statements flatly denying facts patent, notorious and absolutely impossible of contradiction. How then shall we account for this? The only charitable answer is the ignorance of these learned men.

If the mind or eye is fixed long and intently on one little object, it became more oblivious of larger objects. Such narrowness of thought and vision may help to explain the ignorance of German professors respecting matters of international importance. Dr. Hans Delbrück, successor of Treitsche, once said that Germany must expand at the expense of England, France and Russia, by making war upon them. Over and over this sentiment is reiterated by German professors. Students of history are puzzled at the profound ignorance thus displayed in respect to the acquisition of territory.

These professors do not understand the methods by which these nations have won the

"Made in Germany"

possessions for which they are so bitterly envied in Germany. It was not by "everlastingly talking about it, by villifying their rivals, by continually brandishing the sword and elevating into a system the right of the mailed fist. Their empires have grown through the pursuit of immediate and limited aims. They have sought here an outlet to the sea, there a trading station, or the reduction to peace of marauding neighbors on the frontiers. German professional intelligence has taken so false a measure of men and things as to adopt the very course most certain to defeat its aims."

It is no exaggeration to say that learned German professors on both sides of the Atlantic have put forth arguments so unreasonable, illogical and puerile, as to invite universal derision. For example, here is an argument to show that Germany is fighting a defensive war: "As Bismarck said, the German army, since it is an army of the folk itself, is not a weapon for frivolous aggression. Since the German army, when it is summoned to war, represents the whole German people, and since the whole German people is peaceably disposed, it follows that the army can only be a defensive organization." Of course this reasoning would prove that every nation beginning a war is on the defensive. It requires no knowledge of logic to detect the fallacy of such reasoning. It is really an affront to common sense. There is no fool like an educated fool. Nothing has

German Culture

done more harm to the German cause than this twisting of truth, perversion of facts and sophistical, silly arguments of German professors.

The more intelligent among the common people are pretty much in the same category, with this difference, they make mere assertions without explanation or the slightest evidence in support of them. With them assertion is conclusive. Americans receive letters from all parts of Germany justifying her course. They are all alike, bear the same trade mark and the same stamp and may all be entitled, "What all Germans believe." Under this caption the Springfield Republican (Massachusetts) discusses this remarkable phenomenon of uniformity, and accurately analyzes its psychology. It says, "The typical letter runs something as follows:—(1) America has read only lies; (2) This is a defensive war; (3) All Germany is united in supporting the Kaiser; (4) Austria had to punish Servia; (5) Russia began the war; (6) England instigated it; (7) Every German knows that the other nations had long been plotting to destroy Germany and German kultur; (8) Belgium was their secret ally; (9) Atrocities have been perpetrated on Germans whose conduct has been exemplary; (10) German victories have been kept from the world! What these letters conspicuously lack is facts; in place of them we have dogmatic assertions."

"Made in Germany"

How is this uniformity of statement to be accounted for? Their authors, of course, have no first hand knowledge in these matters. How, for example, could they know that other nations were plotting to destroy Germany, especially when no such plotting was ever thought of? "The very uniformity and confidence of the tone," says the Republican, "with which the assertion is made indicates that it has been taught dogmatically, that the Germans have accepted it obediently as a first principle, like the superiority of German culture to all other culture."

Let us suppose that these statements were evolved by the Kaiser and his general staff, hung upon the walls of the war office, printed upon decorated cards, sent to all local officials of the realm for general distribution, together with the instructions that the people assemble daily and repeat in concert these ten great, crucial declarations respecting the war, and any one who shall venture to demand facts for the support of any one of them shall be deemed guilty of unpatriotic conduct.

The results reached by the educational machine in Germany are the same as if the supposition were true. In no other country could such profound ignorance be so scientifically and thoroughly imposed upon the people. In no other country could such blind, absolute obedience as to what all the people should believe and speak be secured. In no other

German Culture

country in the world could the rulers propagate such glaring falsehoods by means of letters from the people written to foreigners all making the same assertions, in the same language and with the same assurance of their truth. "Empty of facts as these naive and impassioned letters are," says the Republican, "they in themselves, in their pathetic uniformity and their unquestioning patriotism, are a fact and an impressive fact. . . . What every German knows, turns out to be simply that he is ready to march when the word comes from above."

We are assured that the Germans are just as sincere and faithful to their convictions as the Allies. When evil doers are sincere and faithful in the perpetration of crime, the evil is intensified. Never were men more sincere or true to their convictions than when the Germans, in violation of solemn treaties, invaded Belgium and "hacked their way through" the burning buildings and dead bodies of innocent men, women and children.

With what sincerity and fidelity to convictions do German submarines torpedo peaceable merchant ships, without notice sending them to the bottom with their unoffending passengers! When Professor Hugo Münsterberg publishes to the world that, "To say that nations ought to respect the possessions of other nations is the grossest immorality," we credit him with sincerity and fidelity to his convic-

"Made in Germany"

tions. That this professor, as a representative German, can commit piracy, theft, massacre, perfidy and falsehood with sincerity and fidelity to conviction we must concede. We stand, however, in mortal terror of the German brand of sincerity and fidelity to conviction. Until these qualities are civilized we want nothing to do with them.

Among the many reasons assigned by German apologists for the war are (1) Conquest; (2) Spread of German culture; (3) A Place in the Sun; (4) Jealousy toward Germany; (5) The Slav Menace; (6) Control of the Balkans; (7) Commercial Supremacy; (8) Military Efficiency; (9) Spontaneous Combustion; (10) War of Protoplasm.

The Sarjevo assassination is no longer regarded as the cause or hardly the occasion for the war. Austria's ultimatum to Serbia was only a pretext for beginning a war fully determined upon and prepared for.

There is one and only one efficient and sufficient cause of this war. It is as old as war itself. It has never failed to produce war and has caused nearly all the wars of history. The other alleged causes for this war are calculated to throw dust in the eyes of the people and divert public attention from the real cause.

Let us first eliminate these fictitious causes, reversing the order of statement and beginning with the last.

German Culture

(10) The war of Protoplasms. Dr. Robert Tuttle Morris in an address on "Warfare as Natural History," described man as a group of protoplasmic cells that were in constant warfare. The war was between two strong types of varietal hybrids, each trying to get control of the other. In this struggle, he says, a "strong, haughty, *nouveau-riche* protoplasm is in conflict with an equally strong, old patrician protoplasm." Dr. Morris, says the New York Times, diagnosed the European conflict as a "free-for-all show-down between Mr. Darwin of England and Mr. Treitschke of Germany." It is thus a battle of protoplasms.

Darwin, however, had another theory beside that of the survival of the fittest; this was the "mutual dependence of protoplasms." This means a recognition by the fighting protoplasmic cells of each other's rights, and an arrangement brought about by the Hague congress, whereby the warring protoplasms will submit to an "international mind." Dr. Morris believes this theory will prevail. The German Treitschke flouts this idea, declares war to be a biological necessity and demands that German protoplasm should ruthlessly crush all other national protoplasms.

If as Dr. Morris asserts, he as a man is a group of fighting protoplasmic cells, we will let some other group tackle him and his theory. Meanwhile we shall continue to regard this war

"Made in Germany"

as caused by and carried on by men who are conscious, intelligent and responsible beings.

(9) "Spontaneous Combustion" is said to have caused the war. This is produced by heat caused by chemical action within the substance itself. No outside agency is responsible. Nobody is to blame. In the moral world it is an effect without a cause and covers a multitude of sins. This view in various forms is a favorite one with those who are advocating the German cause under the guise of neutrality.

(8) "Military Efficiency" as the cause of the war is considered in a former chapter. It is the doctrine put forward by Dr. Jordan, and, like "Spontaneous combustion," relieves all nations and all individuals from any responsibility for beginning the war. Since it is repudiated by all the belligerent nations we may dismiss it at once.

(7) "Commercial Supremacy" is often declared to be the cause of the war. None will deny that commercial interests play an important part in modern wars. In no respect is a nation so sensitive as in matters of trade and commerce.

There are two systems or methods in carrying on industry and commerce, viz.: the competitive and the co-operative, the individualistic and the socialistic. The industrial strife in the United States and in Europe is due to competition. At this writing 150,000 employees are fighting their employers in a strike and

German Culture

lockout, and several have already been killed. Competition in its natural evolution has come to mean war. Cut-throat competition is not a misnomer. Co-operation, on the other hand, makes for peace.

There is no competitive strike, no competitive commercial struggle going on anywhere in the world to-day that could not be settled in an hour by co-operation. Only as co-operation, in some form, is substituted for competition are industrial peace and good will within any single nation, possible. Can the same be said of international relations? We do not think so. The nations as units are so large, their interests so diverse, they are so different in language, habits, civilization, ideals and aspirations, that co-operation in industry and commerce to any extent is impossible. It follows that the nations will for a long time be on a competitive basis.

In the past the extension of trade and commerce may have been deemed a sufficient cause for war. It is so no longer. The moral and social evolution of the race has outlawed it. The attempt of Germany to revive this species of brigandage even by way of pretext in the present war is resented by all nations. Bernhardt says, in "Germany and the Next War," "Our political power gained by war rendered possible the vast progress of our trade and commerce": and he not only justifies but commends war for these objects.

"Made in Germany"

There is more error than truth in this statement. German trade has not developed by following the German flag, but by following up the progress and liberal policies of other countries. This is the chief reason for German trade in India, South America and the United States. Canada has more trade with Germany than with England.

Germany had all the foreign trade she could manage. It exceeded \$4,500,000,000 annually, surpassing that of any other country. She is not waging a commercial war, since no nation placed any obstacle in the way of her unlimited expansion.

Mr. Clarence W. Barron in his interesting volume, "The Audacious War," while laying great emphasis upon the commercial factor in the war, says, Germany had triumphed over all other nations in commerce, "her enterprise, her industry and her merchants have spread themselves over the surface of the earth to a degree little realized."

Germany, therefore, had not the slightest need of a commercial war since she had nothing to gain by it. All doors were freely open to her. Her goods went everywhere. England and most of her colonies let them come in free, while Germany kept English goods out by a twenty per cent. tariff.

It is true that the home trade of any country, especially in an autocratic government will be increased by enlarging the national boundaries,

German Culture

but the struggle is more and more for foreign markets. Admitting that the development of trade may have been a factor in Germany's action in bringing on the war, it was not the efficient cause.

(6) The control of the Balkans as a cause of the war is included in the first alleged cause.

(5) The Slav Menace, another alleged cause of the war, we have seen, on page 105, to be a mere pretence originating in the universities and designed solely to keep up to a white heat the war spirit of the people.

(4) Envy toward Germany. The Kaiser declared that, "Envious people everywhere are compelling us to our just defence."

If German prosperity has been so marvellous in spite of "envious people," why not let well enough alone? What "defence" is needed? Just where and when did the army of "envious people" fall upon Germany? The truth is there was no attack or threatened attack. The only envy that existed was the envy of Germany against England and other countries.

The action of Germany in beginning the war was in no sense a "defence" of any kind, but an open, aggressive assault upon other nations. The Kaiser never appeared at a worse advantage than in giving "envious people" as the cause of war. No one envied Germany. Even if envy existed it furnished not the slightest cause for war and the Kaiser knows it. Falsehood never assumed a thinner or more ridic-

"Made in Germany"

ulous mask than in this utterance of the Kaiser.

(3) "A Place in the Sun" is repeatedly declared to be Germany's object in the war. It means that Germany has no longer room for her population and must, therefore, seize the territory of other nations.

Since 1816 her population has increased from 25,000,000 to 65,000,000, and it is claimed that the people are cramped and in distress and the surplus population cannot exist without an extension of territory. This is important if true. It is not true. German statistics show its falsity. Her agricultural population is no larger to-day than it was a hundred years ago. Her wonderful development in manufacturing has drawn the people into manufacturing centers. By intensive farming the products of the soil have been many times multiplied, so that the staple products, like rye, wheat and potatoes, have trebled. Her foreign trade has so enormously increased that there is a constantly increasing demand for laborers. Note the falling off in emigration. Twenty years ago, 125,000 Germans emigrated yearly to this country. In 1912 we received only 12,500. Notwithstanding the vast increase in population, the consumption in cereals alone for each person has increased 150 per cent.

Mr. Arthur von Gwinner, the leading banker in Germany, wrote an article under the title of "English and German Economics" in 1912, in which occurs the following: "*Germany, as a*

German Culture

matter of fact, has not sufficient people for her land. In spite of her increasing population, over 750,000 agricultural laborers have to be brought yearly from outside our frontiers to till the land and reap the harvest. It is, therefore, as much out of the question to talk of Germany's over-population as of her necessity for exporting men, as long as the world's markets remain open to her for exporting goods, in order to pay for the indispensable imports of food stuffs by export of German industrial energy." This gentleman is one of the men around the Kaiser and an authority. This annual importation of farm laborers is abundantly confirmed. Dr. Franz Oppenheimer, a Professor of Berlin University, says: "*Germany has eighty million acres of agriculture and only seventeen millions of agricultural population; if the land were put to use, the peasants could have all the land they could profitably cultivate, and would be independent, comfortable, middle-class people and almost half of the whole agricultural area would still remain unoccupied."* We are taking our facts and figures only from the highest German authority. *It thus appears that Germany, instead of being over-peopled, is not half populated nor is her agricultural land half tilled.* Instead of being crowded and suffering for want of room, the Germans are extremely prosperous, healthy and happy. These statistics show an increasingly high standard of living,

"Made in Germany"

a decreased death rate, increased demand for labor, decrease of emigration, increase of foreign trade, and a great increase in wealth, especially in Prussia, where, in the sixteen years ending in 1911, the aggregate income increased from 15,000,000,000 marks to 27,000,000,000, a gain of more than eighty per cent. When, therefore, the Kaiser says that on account of increase of population, Germany has to wage war for her right to "A Place in the Sun," he is simply stating what is not true.

(2) Spread of German Culture. We have seen how culture in Germany is related to war, or rather how German apologists have attempted to show that it was the mission of Germany to extend her superior culture over all other nations, and in the fulfillment of this mission she was making this great sacrifice of blood and treasure.

What are Americans to do with this proposition made in all seriousness by the German Emperor, university professors, statesmen and other representatives of the nation?

Let us say at once that the attempt to extend culture by the bayonet is not a rational proceeding. No nation ever did it. There is no precedent for it. It requires a spirit of altruism that Germany does not possess. The history of mankind furnishes no example of such sublime benevolence. Germany, a great and mighty nation, eager to shed the blood of millions of her sons and to spend billions of treas-

German Culture

ure, that she may give to her hated enemies, "barbarous Russia," "frivolous France" and "perfidious England," the one distinguishing possession of her own greatness—her kultur! How shall we reconcile this position with Bernhardt's statement that all brotherly love is bounded by the state line? No, the cause of this war was not the desire to spread German kultur. Of all the causes assigned this is the most far-fetched and insincere. It was designed to give a color of respectability to a monstrous crime.

(1) *The lust for Conquest is the one only efficient and sufficient cause of the war.* Other contributing causes such as the control of the Balkans are all included in this one purpose. Pan-Germanism alone explains the entire situation. All diplomatic negotiations leading up to Germany's declaration of war against Russia, her huge armaments, which she has been piling up for a generation, thus forcing other nations to follow her example or perish, the writings of leading Germans declaring that "war is a good thing"; that it is a "biological necessity"; that it is "ordained of God"; that it is "the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture as well as power"; that it has "achieved greater things than love"; the toast, "To the Day," that the German navy has been drinking for years and which means the day of German domination not only of Europe but of the world; and pages of similar utterances, all

"Made in Germany"

show conclusively the one supreme purpose of Germany as declared by her foremost representative, viz., "World Power or Downfall." Bernhardi admits our contention thus: "New territory must be obtained at the cost of its possessors—that is to say, by conquest. . . . It is not the possessor but the victor who then has the right."

Conquest then is the one solution of the war. It explains all the problems connected with it. It alone accounts for the German doctrine of *Machtpolitik*—the doctrine that might makes right, which has been a veritable Pandora's box, letting loose in Germany the above named abominable principles unblushingly avowed by her philosophers.

All the excuses, explanations, prevarications, apologies and falsehoods as to the causes of the war, are resolved into thin air and disappear before the word conquest. The pretended struggle for existence, the danger of a Russian invasion, the need of expansion, French revenge, a defensive war, British envy, are miserable subterfuges to cover up Germany's wicked purpose to dominate Europe and the world.

Everywhere men are asking what this war is about, what does Germany want? The answer is, conquest. Conquest also explains the savagery inaugurated by Germany in prosecuting the war. Americans have been reluctant to admit that the lust of conquest was the

German Culture

sole cause of the war. With the new sense of right that now prevails, such a reversal to barbarism in a country so enlightened as Germany was unthinkable.

What are the motives behind a war of conquest? The answer is, the basest passions in the human breast. In the highest authority on earth we read, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not from your lusts that war in your members?" Here ends the search for the cause of the war. Lust is the psychology of conquest; power-lust, land-lust, spoils-lust, money-lust, blood-lust, fame-lust, hatred-lust and vengeance-lust.

It is this vile, festering, loathsome swarm of lusts, detested by all right minded men, that Germany summons to her aid in her war of conquest. She will not succeed. The stars in their courses are fighting against her. In all that makes for peace, good will and brotherhood, Christendom has moved forward more in the last hundred years than in all the centuries of the Christian era.

It has pleased Almighty God to convert steam, electricity and machinery into a world evangel girdling the earth with the steamboat, the railroad and the telegraph, which He is employing as the winged messengers of fraternity and love.

On the border line between Chili and Argentina, these nations have erected a beautiful monument of peace. The granite base is sur-

"Made in Germany"

mounted with a colossal statue of the Christ. In his left hand He holds a cross, while his right hand stretches toward the skies, invoking the benediction of Heaven upon the world, to whom with solemn ceremony the monument was dedicated. It bears this inscription:—
"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust, than the Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

In this sign the nations will conquer war. Let this sublime sentiment be enthroned at the Hague. On every border land between the nations let a similar monument be erected inscribed in letters, deep cut and ineffaceable, with a covenant of perpetual peace, and then the glad day will have come, when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks and the nations shall learn war no more.

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW.

4 FEB 22 1974

APR 9 1974



